The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXIII, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1950

CONTENTS

Catholic Doctrine and "The Religion of the State"
George W. Shea 161

The Marian Character of the Redemption
Auguste Ferland, S.S. 175

The Priest and Mr. Blanshard's Book
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 180

The Mariology of St. Thomas . . *Urban Mullaney, O.P.* 188

Genesis I-XI and Prehistory. Part II
Edward P. Arbez, S.S. 202

The Relation of the Christian State to the Catholic Church According to the *Pontificale Romanum*
Joseph Clifford Fenton 214

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Supplementary Confessor of Religious Women 219

The Form of Marriage 220

Moral Problems in Surgery 220

Solemn Mass or Solemn High Mass 221

The Hymn of Exposition in the Vernacular 222

The Material of the Tabernacle Veil 222

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(Contents Continued from Previous Page)

When the Name of the Ordinary is not a Saint's Name . 223

Minister of Exposition and the Ministering Deacon . . 224

BOOK REVIEWS

The Apostolic Parish, *by James J. Navagh* 225

The Great Mantle, *by Katherine Burton* 227

Vestments and Vestures, *by E. A. Roulin, O.S.B.* 230

Quellen des Heils, Die Sakramente der Katholischen Kirche, *by Joseph Barbel, C.SS.R.* 231

The Mystical Evolution in the Development and Vitality of the Church, Vol. I, *by J. G. Arintero, O.P.* . . . 232

Mexico: A Land of Volcanoes, *by Joseph H. L. Schlarman* 234

The Nazarene, *by Eugenio Zolli* 236

The Family at Bethany, *by Alfred O'Rahilly* 237

BOOK NOTES 239

The Message of Christ

SERMON SKETCHES

by

DR. ADOLPH DONDERS

Translated by REV. RUDOLPH KRAUS, PH.D., S.T.D.

$6.00

The 169 pages of this work contain sermon sketches, arranged according to the ecclesiastical year and based largely on the Gospels.

The treatment of the subjects is marked by three outstanding features.

1. The wealth of spiritual contents. Thus the Scripture text is seen to embrace, imply, or suggest a surprising extent of moral doctrine and exhortation.

2. The order. The arrangement, following the seasons and the Sundays of the Church year, makes the volume convenient for priests, who usually preach on some text taken from the Sunday Gospel.

3. The divisions. Each sketch is so divided that it may serve for use in the preparation of a full-length sermon or for five-minute homilies.

Since, especially in large parishes, the priests, even with abundant zeal and good will, find the available time inadequate for painstaking preparation of the Sunday sermon, they will welcome this convenient aid.

AT YOUR BOOKSTORE OR FROM THE

B. HERDER BOOK COMPANY

15 & 17 So. Broadway **St. Louis 2, Mo.**

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND "THE RELIGION OF THE STATE"

What is the veritable Catholic "thesis" on Church-state relationships? More precisely, what, in reality, is the authentic, perennially valid and unalterable Catholic doctrine concerning the relations between Catholic Church and Catholic state, the relations which should *per se* obtain by reason of the nature of Church and state in a Catholic society, so that any deviation from these relations, while tolerable perhaps as a concession prompted by expediency, could not merit approval on principle? This question, then, confines itself to theory, to principles, and in turn it is to this question so put (or aspects of it) that the following pages confine themselves. That is to say, it is altogether beyond the scope of this brief paper to discuss what concessions may be made in practice, what departures from the principles, the theory, the norm, would be legitimate and in order in various concrete circumstances.

The answer to be given to the foregoing question is currently a matter of lively debate among Catholic theologians. On the one hand, claiming to be the authentic Catholic "thesis," there is what its opponents term the "old thesis," "the nineteenth-century thesis," though in substance it is still the teaching generally presented in manuals of theology and of *Jus Publicum Ecclesiasticum,* even those of most recent vintage.[1] On the other hand, there are the views of several Catholic scholars, here and abroad, who, after a searching re-examination of the "old thesis," have contended that it needs radical revision, substantial modifications. Pre-eminent among the champions of these more liberal views is John Courtney Murray, S.J., who has brought to bear against the "old thesis" impressive erudition, remarkable dexterity, and an uncommon command of language.[2] Withal, it must be asked: Has Fr. Murray, to date, successfully vanquished the "old thesis" in any of its essentials? If one who claims no special competence in the matter be allowed to venture an opinion, I would say that he has not. For whatever they are worth, some reasons for this opinion are respectfully submitted in the following pages, as simply and briefly as a complicated controversy permits.

---

[1] Cf. the new edition of J. M. Hervé, *Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae,* (Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1949), I, 520-35; P. Parente, *Theologia Fundamentalis* (Turin: Marietti, 1946), pp. 172-77; R. Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., *De Revelatione,* ed. 4 (Rome: Libreria Editrice Religiosa F. Ferrari, 1945), II, 411-25; A. Vellico, O.F.M., *De Ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Editiones Comm. A. Arnodo, 1940), pp. 605-39; L. Lercher, S.J., *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae,* ed. 3, *cur.* F. Schlagenhaufen, S.J. (Innsbruck: F. Rauch, 1939), I, 244-45, 251; N. Jung, *Le Droit public de l'Église* (Paris: Procure Générale du Clergé, 1948), pp. 109-37; A. Ottaviani, *Institutiones Iuris Publici Ecclesiastici,* ed. 3 (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1948), II, 46-252; L. Bender, O.P., *Ius Publicum Ecclesiasticum* (Bussum: P. Brand, 1948), pp. 169-200; F. Marchesi, S.J., *Summula Iuris Publici Ecclesiastici* (Naples: M. D'Auria, 1948), pp. 114-130.

I

A key issue in the whole debate is the standing, within the framework of Catholic doctrine, of the constitutional concept of "the religion of the state."[3] For the concept itself, we may turn to Fr. Murray:

> As it has historically appeared in the nation-states of post-Reformation Europe, this concept asserts that the state itself, the organized political community does more than recognize the juridical personality of the Church as a visible religious society in her own right, with autonomous powers and definite rights over her members; by itself this recognition would not make the Church the religion of the state. The concept also asserts that the state as such makes public profession of Catholicism as its own one and only religion; and by consequence it asserts that no citizen may make public profession of any other religion. In further consequence, the coercive power of the state is brought to bear to inhibit the public profession or propaganda of other religions.[4]

What is under discussion is the state when it is the body-politic of a Catholic people. And the problem before us comes to this: Is the official and exclusive recognition and profession of Catholicism by the state, with whatever logical and juridical consequences

---

[2] Fr. Murray's major contributions to the subject are: "Governmental Repression of Heresy," *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America,* Third Annual Meeting (Chicago, June 28-30, 1949), pp. 26-98; "St. Robert Bellarmine on the Indirect Power," *Theological Studies,* IX (1948), 491-535; "Contemporary Orientations of Catholic Thought on Church and State in the Light of History," *Theological Studies,* X (1949), 177-234; "Current Theology on Religious Freedom," *Theological Studies,* X (1949), 409-32.

[3] Cf. Murray, *Theological Studies,* X (1949), 183 f., 227-234, 422-432.

[4] *Ibid.,* 424.

—as regards other religions—may follow from such a constitutional situation of "religion of the state," permanently and unalterably part of the genuine Catholic "thesis," obligatory from the nature of Church and state in a Catholic society? "Is it . . . the theologically necessary, permanently valid, unalterably ideal realization of Catholic principles on Church-state relationships?"[5]

Fr. Murray's answer is in the negative. He takes the position that a constitutional situation of "the religion of the state" is at most obligatory only if and insofar as it is a means necessary to ensure the freedom of the Church.[6] With this as his major premise, Fr. Murray then argues, in effect: Now, the future may hold undreamed-of modes of government wherein the freedom of the Church would be guaranteed without need of recourse to a constitutional situation of "the religion of the state"[7]—indeed, such a mode is already with us, in modern democracy, of the better sort.[8] *Ergo,* "the religion of the state," since it is but a particular and contingent manner of realizing the Church's freedom, does not enjoy a necessary and permanent status in Catholic doctrine.

With this conclusion in hand, Fr. Murray considers that Catholic principles leave room for a body-politic of a Catholic people which would be, not a "Catholic state," but a "lay state,"[9] somewhat on the following order, I gather: one wherein, to be sure, the state would reckon with the reality of the Church,[10] would recognize the unique juridical personality of the Church and the existence, in an order higher than that of the state, of an external spiritual authority that has an independent sovereignty over all its subjects in all that concerns their spiritual and moral life, even as citizens and rulers,[11] wherein there would be right moral and juridical relationships between the Church and the state,[12] and to that extent no separation of Church and state,[13] wherein, however, Catholicism would not be "the religion of the state," would not be publicly professed by the state as its own one and only religion, and in consequence without inhibition by the state of public profession or propaganda of other religions.[14] Such a relationship of Church and state, Fr. Murray holds, is called for by a modern democracy, whose historical emergence is said to correspond to a fundamental intention of nature[15] (and therefore of God), and which would collapse, it is to be feared, if public profession or propaganda of false religions be inhibited.[16]

---

[5] *Ibid,* 229; cf. 430.

[6] *Ibid.,* 183, 229 f., 233, 422 f., 425 f., 430.

[7] *Ibid.,* pp. 425 f.

[8] *Ibid.,* 189 f., 223-26, 233 f.

[9] Lay; not laicist, laicizing, secularist. Cf. Murray, "Governmental Repression of Heresy," pp. 30, 63; *idem, Theological Studies,* X (1949), 188-90, 200, 225 f., 232.

[10] Cf. "Governmental Repression of Heresy," p. 80, and, for an extended discussion of how this reckoning would work out, see the whole section, pp. 70-85.

[11] *Ibid.,* pp. 89-90; cf. *Theological Studies,* X (1949), 424.

Before accepting all this, one would like, among other things, to be sure about the validity of Fr. Murray's initial premise: there is room for considerable doubt that the theological necessity or non-necessity of "the religion of the state" depends solely on the latter's necessity or non-necessity for the freedom of the Church. To be fair, Fr. Murray has not simply assumed the truth of this premise. On the contrary, he has made valiant efforts to dispose of various conceivable objections against his major premise, i.e., arguments wishing to vindicate the theological necessity of "the religion of the state" whether the Church's freedom be at stake or not. That these efforts have been successful in every case, I am not sure. Happily, however, there is no need to go into all that as long as a simpler course is available—of asking whether Fr. Murray has considered *all* the arguments.

Thus, on the question of the theological necessity or non-necessity of "the religion of the state" one would like to see some explicit discussion of the possible implications of a "major obligation which natural law imposes on the State—that is, on organized society with its agencies of government . . . the obligation to acknowledge God as its author, to worship Him as He wills to be worshipped, and to subject its official life and action to His law," which "absolute obligation includes also the hypothetical obligation of accepting a higher belief, law, and mode of worship, if God reveals them as His will."

---

[12] Cf. Murray, "Freedom of Religion: I. The Ethical Problem," *Theological Studies*, VI (1945), 268; *idem*, *Theological Studies*, X (1949), 423.

[13] Cf. *Theological Studies*, VI (1945), 268, and "Governmental Repression of Heresy," pp. 89 f.

[14] Cf. *Theological Studies*, X (1949), 234, 424, and "Governmental Repression of Heresy," p. 84.

[15] Cf. *Theological Studies*, X (1949), 181-83, 231, 233 f.

[16] *Ibid.*, 182 f.

As to this obligation itself, whatever its implications may be, Fr. Murray undoubtedly concedes it, since the words just quoted derive from an earlier article of his[17] and do but sum up what is classic and certain doctrine among Catholic philosophers[18] and theologians,[19] doctrine confirmed by the Popes, as will be seen later.

What the philosophers and theologians have to say, relevant to the matter in hand, can be given only in resumé. That man has the duty not only of individual but also of social worship, is elementary Catholic doctrine.[20] In treating of this obligation of social worship, authors go on to affirm that even the state, *qua* state, not simply "society" but the politically organized community, civil society as such, is bound to profess religion, the true religion; to worship God in the way He wills to be worshipped; and is so bound by the natural law. It is understood, of course, that the state is a moral person, able to be the subject of duties, and to fulfill them, only through the medium of physical persons, the individual members who compose it. Concretely, then, the state professes, exercises religion, worships God, through official acts of those placed in authority. To satisfy its religious obligations, the state must worship God not only indirectly, virtually, administratively, but also directly and formally.[21] That is to say, not only, for example, by abstaining from whatever is contrary to divine law, not only by positive furtherance of public religion, not only by legislation, *ex motivo religionis,* against perjury, public blasphemy, writings inimical to public religion and morality, etc., but also by official participation in acts of worship properly so-called—of adoration, thanksgiving, supplication, and the like. The basic argument for all this, employed to prove the state's obligation of direct and formal divine worship in addition to that of worshipping indirectly, virtually, administratively,[22] since it is more fully stated in papal utterances below, may thus be given in barest essence.

---

[17] "Freedom of Religion: I. The Ethical Problem," *Theological Studies*, VI (1945), 266, with note 9b.

[18] Cf. V. Cathrein, S.J., *Philosophia Moralis*, ed. 17, *cur.* J. Schuster, S.J. (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1935), pp. 432-434, 438 f.; J. Donat, S.J., *Ethica Specialis*, ed. 5 (Innsbruck: F. Rauch), pp. 236 f., 256 f.; E. Cahill, S.J., *Framework of the Christian State* (Dublin: Gill and Son, 1932), pp. 466 f., 601, 607; Ryan-Boland, *Catholic Principles of Politics* (New York: Macmillan, 1940), p. 311; H. Rommen, *The State in Catholic Thought* (St. Louis: Herder, 1945), pp. 366 f.

[19] Cf. treatises on Moral Theology, *Ius Publicum Ecclesiasticum*, and Fundamental Theology. In the latter discipline, the teaching is a standard thesis of the tract *De Vera Religione*, and reappears in the tract *De Ecclesia* as an argument against separation of Church and state; cf. Lercher, *op. cit.*, 8 f., 244; Hervé, *op. cit.*, 30, 523, 526 f.; Garrigou-Lagrange, *op. cit.*, 411 f.; S. Tromp, S.J., *De Revelatione Christiana*, ed. 4 (Rome: Gregorian University, 1937), p. 37; J. Herrmann, C.SS.R., *Institutiones Theologiae Dogmaticae*, ed. 7, *cur.* Stebler-Raus (Lyons-Paris: E. Vitte, 1937), I, 83, 492; A. Dorsch, S.J., *Institutiones Theologiae Fundamentalis*, ed. 3 (Innsbruck: F. Rauch, 1930), I, 271-272; L. Billot, S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, ed. 3 (Rome: Gregorian University, 1929), II, 84-86; M. d'Herbigny, S.J., *Theologica de Ecclesia*, ed. 3 (Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1927), I, 140; G. Lahousse, S.J., *De Vera Religione* (Louvain: C. Peeters, 1897), pp. 45-48; G. Wilmers, S.J., *De Religione Revelata* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1897), pp. 26 f.; T. Zigliara, O.P., *Propaedeutica ad S. Theologiam*, ed. 4 (Rome: Typographia Polyglotta, 1897), pp. 203 f.; C. Mazzella, S.J., *De Religione et Ecclesia* (Rome: Typographia Polyglotta, 1880), pp. 21, 25 f., 456 f. Cf. also the (*Primum*) *Schema Constitutionis Dogmaticae de Ecclesia* drawn up at the Vatican Council: *cap.* xiii (*Collectio Lacensis*, VII, 573b), and the theologians' *adnotationes* thereto (*ibid.*, 622d, 623d-624a).

The state is a creature of God, for He is the author of man's social nature, of all authority in the state, of all the benefits the state enjoys; therefore, the state must acknowledge its dependence on God, by appropriate acts of worship. If the state be, indeed, "of the natural law," one can hardly dispute this argument. Further, one perceives that, if it holds for any state, the argument holds for all—for all forms, those known and those undreamed-of, for juridical democracy and for any other new realizations in the reality of the "state" which historical evolution has brought or may yet bring about.

---

[20] Cf. Pius XII, Ency. *Mediator Dei, AAS* XXXIX (1947), pp. 525 f., 530 f.; English transl., *Mediator Dei: On the Sacred Liturgy* (New York: Paulist Press), pp. 17 f, 35.

[21] Cf. Dorsch, *op. cit.,* I. 271 f.; Lahousse, *op. cit.,* pp. 45-48; Donat, *op. cit.,* p. 236.

[22] Cf. Dorsch, *op. cit.,* I, 272.

To continue the resumé—the state is no less a creature of God, and therefore no less bound to worship Him, for all that the actual order of things is a supernatural order, that a supernatural religion, the Catholic, has been revealed as obligatory for all men, that a supernatural religious society, the Catholic Church, has been divinely instituted for the worship of God. Given these facts, the state, in conformity with its obligation under natural law to profess the true religion, to worship God as He decrees ("the hypothetical obligation of accepting a higher belief, law, and mode of worship, if God reveals them as His will"), has then the duty of accepting Catholicism, its creed, code, cult. The objective duty exists for all; and where the objective duty is sufficiently known, the duty is subjective as well. This latter obtains in the case of a Catholic society. For in such case the state is not in the position of having to discover the true religion. It does not have to seek for that which has been found and is known in advance by the Catholic people of which the state is the body-politic. It has rather but to acknowledge what the Catholic populace acknowledges, the divine institution of the Catholic Church.[23] That the state finds the Church in this wise, indirectly, through the medium of the Catholic citizenry, does not mean that the state has no direct duties towards the Church. For, in the supernatural order no less than in the natural, the state remains a creature of God, and, as such, and as a perfect society really distinct from the Church, has its own duty of divine homage, of worshipping God as He wills to be worshipped, a duty which the state cannot fulfill apart from the Church.

Such would seem to be the mind of the representative authors we have been consulting. What are the implications of all this as to the question of the theological necessity of "the religion of the state"? It is difficult to understand why the foregoing considerations should not call for the conclusion that, in a Catholic society, it is incumbent upon the state to be a "Catholic state," to declare and to treat Catholicism as "the religion of the state." The formal, official, and exclusive recognition and profession of Catholicism by the state in a Catholic society as its own one and only religion, in short, the establishment of Catholicism as "the religion of the state," seems necessarily contained in the very notion of the state's duty to accept and profess the true religion, therefore Catholicism, with its creed, code, and cult. How else could the state, *qua* state, in truth accept and profess Catholicism, together with its tenet that it alone is the true religion?

---

[23] Cf. L. Choupin, S.J., *Valeur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège*, ed. 3 (Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1928), p. 272; Garrigou-Lagrange, *op. cit.*, II, 420, *rsp. ad obj.* 1. Cf. also Rommen, *op. cit.*, p. 367.

If such a conclusion be conceded, one must then face up to the problem of what ought to be the state's attitude toward, and dealings with, the heterodox: the problem of what "logical and juridical consequences," as regards sects, should flow from the situation of Catholicism as "the religion of the state." Before a further word is said on this subject, let it be noted at once that no Catholic holds or may hold that the state would be called upon to impose the Catholic faith on dissident citizens. Reverence for the individual conscience forbids this, and the very nature of religion and of the act of faith. If these be not voluntary, they are nought.[24] Further, it is agreed to by all that the members of sects must be permitted the private external exercise of their religion. Neither of these points, then, enters into the question, when one comes to debate the problem of the "logical and juridical consequences" of Catholicism as "the religion of the state." What is, however, very much in question, is this: Would the Catholic state be under moral obligation (*per se*—as was stated at the very outset, our whole discussion has been moving at the level of principles) to restrict sects in such matters as the public profession and exercise of their false religion, in their propaganda, the spread of their heretical doctrines?

It is no secret that the defenders of the "old thesis" answer in the affirmative. They consider such action by the state inherent in the logic of the state's duty to accept and profess Catholicism, a necessary consequence of the situation of Catholicism as "the religion of the state."[25] And that it was the mind of Pius XI that "the religion of the state" entailed some manner of sectarian restriction, is candidly acknowledged by Fr. Murray.[26] To counter certain utterances of Mussolini anent the import of the Lateran Pacts (Treaty and Concordat), the Pope, in his letter of May 30, 1929, to Cardinal Gasparri, published in the *Osservatore Romano* on June 5, 1929—two days before the formal ratification of the Lateran Pacts—forcefully insisted that it be "clearly and loyally understood that the Catholic religion, and it alone, according to the Statute and the Treaties, is the religion of the state with the logical and juridical consequences of such a situation of constitutional law, especially with reference to propaganda"; and the Pope went on to add that full liberty of discussion is inadmissable, since some forms of discussion can easily trick unenlightened minds and become a cloak for harmful propaganda.[27]

---

[24] Leo XIII, Ency. *Immortale Dei*: "The Church is wont to take earnest heed that no one shall be forced to embrace the Catholic faith against his will, for, as St. Augustine wisely reminds us, 'Man cannot believe otherwise than of his own free will.'" The passage is found in the *Codicis iuri scanonici fontes* (hereinafter designated by CICF), cura Em̃i Petri Card. Gasparri editi (Romae: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1926-39), III, 245 f.; and in DB, 1875; Engl. transl., *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 127.—Cf. also the Code of Canon Law, can. 752, 1; can. 1351. Also, Pius XII, Ency. *Mystici Corporis Christi,* June 29, 1943, in *AAS* XXXV (1943), 243; Eng. transl., *The Mystical Body of Christ* (New York: The America Press), nn. 122 f. See also Pius XII, Allocution to the Roman Rota, Oct. 6, 1946; *AAS* XXXVIII (1946), 393 f.; Engl. transl. in T. Bouscaren, S.J., *Canon Law Digest, Supplement 1948* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1949), pp. 255-257.

What Fr. Murray himself actually holds in his particular matter is not altogether clear. When he has occasion to refer to such "consequences," he is inclined to add some qualifications, as when he writes, " 'logical and juridical consequences' that have *historically* followed from that concept ["religion of the state"]";[28] or when he puts it that these consequences have been "*considered* 'logical.' "[29] On the other hand, I have not noted any assertion of Fr. Murray that such consequences are not, in truth, "logical." In the light of the utterances of Pius XI, given above, and of other Popes, to be quoted presently, such reticence is understandable. Fr. Murray has been able to avoid facing up to the problem by disputing the basic supposition of the problem, the theological necessity of "the religion of the state":

> Finally, the question is not whether, in a "constitutional situation" wherein is enshrined the concept of "religion of the state," there fol-

---

[25] See, for example, Ottaviani, *op. cit.*, II, 51-57.

[26] *Theological Studies*, X (1949), 227.

[27] Cf. *AAS* XXI (1929), 301; J. Lo Grasso, S.J., *Ecclesia et Status* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1939), nn. 831 f.; *America*, June 15, 1929, pp. 219-220.

[28] *Theological Studies*, X (1949), 229; italics mine.

[29] *Ibid.*, 183; italics mine.

> low certain "logical and juridical consequences" with regard to the suppression of other forms of belief and worship.
>
> For the theologian, the basic question concerns that constitutional situation itself—is it or is it not the theologically necessary, permanently valid, unalterably ideal realization of Catholic principles on Church-state relationships? . . . Surely the answer must be no.[30]

But what if the answer must be yes? To ask this question has been one of the reasons for this paper.

II

It is time now that the Popes be heard on the matters under discussion in this paper. I single out a few of the relevant utterances, notably of Leo XIII. That this Pontiff more than once approved the concept of "the religion of the state" is conceded by Fr. Murray, who contends, however (if I understand him correctly, and may sum up his views in my own words), that Leo XIII did not thereby wish to teach the theological necessity of "the religion of the state"—his approval of the latter was given only because and insofar as "the religion of the state" was *then* necessary to ensure the well-being of the Church, and of the state as well, against the onslaughts of Continental Liberalism.[31] I am prepared to grant that Leo XIII may have approved "the religion of the state" for contingent reasons; but I am not prepared to grant that he approved it for such reasons *alone*. To my mind, in his vindication of "the religion of the state" the Pope adduced at least one doctrinal reason, of permanent validity, for "the religion of the state," and thereby taught the theological necessity of the latter. The reason? The state, *qua* state, must worship God, because it is a creature of God.

In the Encyclical *Humanum genus*, Apr. 20, 1884, the Pontiff declared:

> To have in public matters no care for religion, and in the arrangement and administration of civil affairs to have no more regard for God than if He did not exist, is a rashness unknown to the very pagans. . . . Human society, indeed, for which by nature we are formed, has been constituted by God the Author of nature; and from Him, as from their principle and source, flow in all their strength and permanence the

---

[30] *Ibid.*, 229.

[31] *Ibid.*, 231-33.

countless benefits with which society abounds. As we are each of us admonished by the very voice of nature to worship God in piety and holiness, as the Giver unto us of life and of all that is good therein, so also and for the same reason, nations and States (*populi et civitates*) are bound to worship Him; and therefore it is clear that those who would absolve society (*civilem communitatem*) from all religious duty act not only unjustly but also with ignorance and folly.[32]

More instructive still is the Encyclical *Immortale Dei,* issued Nov. 1, 1885:

> As a consequence, the State (*civitatem*), constituted as it is, is clearly bound to act up to the manifold and weighty duties linking it to God, by the public profession of religion. Nature and reason, which command every individual devoutly to worship God in holiness, because we belong to Him and must return to Him since from Him we came, bind also the civil community by a like law. For men living together in society are under the power of God no less than individuals are, and society, not less than individuals, owes gratitude to God, who gave it being and maintains it, and whose ever-bounteous goodness enriches it with countless blessings. Since, then, no one is allowed to be remiss in the service due to God, and since the chief duty of all men is to cling to religion in both its teaching and practice—not such religion as they may have a preference for, but the religion which God enjoins, and which certain and most clear marks show to be the only one true religion—it is a public crime to act as though there were no God. So, too, is it a sin in the State not to have care for religion, as a something beyond its scope, or as of no practical benefit; or out of many forms of religion to adopt that one which chimes in with the fancy; for we [better: "they"—*civitates . . . debent*] are bound absolutely to worship God in that way which He has shown to be His will. All who rule, therefore, should hold in honor the holy name of God, and one of their chief duties must be to favor religion, to protect it. . . .[33]

Later in the same Encyclical, Leo XIII cites as reprehensible the views:

> The State (*civitas*) does not consider itself bound by any kind of duty towards God. Moreover, it believes that it is not obliged to make public profession of any religion; or to inquire which of the very many religions is the only one true; or to prefer one religion to all the rest; or to show to any form of religion special favor; but, on the con-

---

[32] CICF, III, 229; *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII,* pp. 97 f.

[33] CICF, III, 236 f.; *The Great Encyclical Letters . . .,* pp. 110 f.

trary, is bound to grant equal rights to every creed, so that public order may not be disturbed by any particular form of religious belief.[34]

Perhaps most significant of all is the passage in the same Pontiff's Encyclical *Libertas,* June 20, 1888:

> This kind of liberty (liberty of cult), if considered in relation to the State, clearly implies that there is no reason why the State should offer any homage to God, or should desire any public recognition of Him; that no one form of worship is to be preferred to another, but that all stand on an equal footing, no account being taken of the religion of the people, even if they profess the Catholic faith. But, to justify this, it must needs be taken as true that the State has no duties towards God, or that such duties, if they exist, can be abandoned with impunity, both of which assertions are manifestly false. For it cannot be doubted but that, by the will of God, men are united in civil society; whether its component parts be considered; or its form, which implies authority; or the object of its existence; or the abundance of the vast services which it renders to man. God it is who has made man for society, and has placed him in the company of others like himself, so that what was wanting to his nature, and beyond his attainment if left to his own resources, he might obtain by association with others. Wherefore civil society (*civilis societas, quia societas est*) must acknowledge God as its Founder and Parent, and must obey and reverence His power and authority. Justice therefore forbids, and reason itself forbids, the State to be godless; or to adopt a line of action which would end in godlessness—namely, to treat the various religions (as they call them) alike, and to bestow upon them promiscuously equal rights and privileges. Since, then, the profession of one religion is necessary in the State, that religion must be professed which alone is true, and which can be recognized without difficulty, especially in Catholic States, because the marks of truth are, as it were, engraven upon it. . . .[35]

There is room for but one more relevant pronouncement of the Popes. Pius X wrote in his Encyclical *Vehementer nos,* Feb. 11, 1906:

> That the State should be separated from the Church is an absolutely false and most pernicious thesis. For first, since it is based on the principle that religion should be of no concern to the State, it does a grave injury to God, He who is the founder and conserver of human society no less than He is of individual men, for which reason He should be worshipped not only privately but also publicly.[36]

---

[34] CICF, III, 242; *The Great Encyclical Letters . . .,* p. 121.

[35] CICF, III, 304; *The Great Encyclical Letters . . .,* pp. 150 f.

[36] CICF, III, 662.

As I see it, these various papal pronouncements bear upon the state, *qua* state; not simply on "society" considered as the pre-political "matter" to which the state imparts a political "form." The state, to which man's God-given social nature impels him, is a creature of God, and as such is bound by the natural law to worship God, and in the way He wills. If this be conceded, it should not be necessary to pursue any further the significance of such papal utterances for the various points discussed in the previous section of this paper.

III

Intimately connected with the debate about "religion of the state" and about the matter of "consequences" flowing therefrom, is the question whether the government of a state can be said to have the right and duty of suppressing heresy. By suppressing or repressing heresy is not meant the "extermination" of heretics, or the application of force or pressure to make the heterodox give up their convictions. The question has rather to do with the inhibiting of heretical propaganda, legal restrictions placed upon the public circulation of heretical doctrines. It is Fr. Murray's oft-expressed contention that, *in thesi*, a government has no right or duty thus to repress heresy.[37] Correlatively, the Church would not have the right, *in thesi*, to call upon the government to do so. This position of his is another of the substantial modifications which Fr. Murray believes should be made in the "old thesis." And here, again, I am not sure that he has proved his case. In a paper already grown too long, it is not possible to discuss whether Fr. Murray has successfully explained away various papal pronouncements of an earlier day, which are advanced as arguments against his position. It seems enough to follow the simpler course already adopted in the previous sections—of asking whether Fr. Murray has considered *all* the adverse arguments.

Namely, it seems to me that one must ponder the implications, in the present matter, of Canon 1381, section 3, in the Code of Canon Law.[38] The latter, of course, is an authoritative expression of the mind of the contemporary Church on what she considers to be her rights. Now, the Canon in question asserts that the religious instruction of (Catholic) youth in all schools whatsoever (public, therefore, as well as Catholic), is subject to the authority of and supervision by the Church (section 1); that the local Ordinaries have the right and duty of vigilance over all schools in their territory, lest anything be taught or done in these schools contrary to faith or morals (section 2); that the same Ordinaries have the right to approve the teachers and text-books of religion, and to demand, in the interests of religion and morality, that teachers and text-books be removed (section 3).

---

[37] See, for example, Fr. Murray's "Governmental Repression of Heresy," e. g., p. 27.

[38] C.I.C., can. 1381:

1. Religiosa iuventutis institutio in scholis quibuslibet auctoritati et inspectioni Ecclesiae subiicitur.

As I see it, Canon 1381, section 3, amounts to the assertion by the Church of her right to call upon the civil authorities, who control the public schools, to inhibit the spread of heresy. Moreover, the Church has called upon various states to acknowledge this her right, as could readily be shown from various modern Concordats. Now, since the Church may neither demand nor claim the right to demand, that civil authority do something illicit, it should follow that civil authority, the government of a state, has, even *in thesi,* the right, and, when called upon to exercise it, the duty of "repressing heresy."

That said, I conclude this attempt to indicate some of the reasons why I have found it difficult to subscribe to Fr. Murray's views. I have, of course, too great respect for the complexities of the problem, "What is the veritable 'Catholic thesis'?" and too great a respect for Fr. Murray's superior grasp of those complexities, to suppose that the difficulties I have suggested are altogether incapable of solution. But, meanwhile, they remain very real difficulties for me, and they move me to say that a recent description of the "old thesis" as "somewhat obsolescent"[39] is somewhat premature.

GEORGE W. SHEA

Immaculate Conception Seminary
Darlington, N. J.

---

2. Ordinariis locorum ius et officium est vigilandi ne in quibusvis scholis sui territorii quidquam contra fidem vel bonos mores tradatur aut fiat.

3. Eisdem similiter ius est approbandi religionis magistros et libros; itemque, religionis morumque causa, exigendi ut tum magistri tum libri removeantur.

[39] Cf. the review of Hervé, *op. cit.*, by Sheedy, C.S.C., in *Speculum,*

THE MARIAN CHARACTER OF THE REDEMPTION

(I) *Mary's consent to the Incarnation by itself would assure a Marian note to the Redemption.*

"God sent the angel Gabriel to a city of Galilee called Nazareth, where a virgin dwelt, betrothed to a man of David's lineage; his name was Joseph, and the virgin's name was Mary. Into her presence the angel came and said . . . Mary, do not be afraid, thou hast found favour in the sight of God. And behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call him Jesus. He shall be great, and men will know him for the Son of the most High. . . . The Holy Spirit will come upon thee, and the power of the most High will overshadow thee. Thus this holy offspring of thine shall be known for the Son of God. . . . And Mary said, Behold the handmaid of the Lord; let it be unto me according to thy word."[1]

Was Mary unaware of the contents and of the scope of this celestial message? Could we dare pretend this without wronging God? Can we assert the same without dishonoring His Mother? Would not the Incarnation cease to be a mystery of wisdom and of love if it had had to be accomplished by offending man's liberty and by diminishing his responsibility?

Unquestionably, the young Virgin did not as yet know, for the moment, *all* the events which must encompass the existence of her Son; but she knows exactly the consequences of her acceptance. She had read, in the Holy Scriptures, the divine promises, in particular the prophecies of Daniel (6:13-14) and those of Isaias (53:1-12) concerning the Servant of God, His sufferings, His ignominious death. Often had she meditated upon the afflictions and torments of the future Redeemer, foreseen by the Prophet of the Passion. "But he was wounded for our iniquities: he was bruised for our sins. The chastisement of our peace was upon him: and by his bruises we are healed."[2]

In the eyes of Mary, to conceive and bear the Messiah did not mean to engender a future victor who would cover himself with glory; on the contrary, it meant to become the mother of one despised, scoffed at, enveloped in opprobrium, and crowned with thorns. The angel Gabriel asked her if she was willing to be the mother of a martyr who would be the Saviour of His people by the complete shedding of His blood. And Mary, drawing an invincible courage from her love for God and men, answered: "*Ecce ancilla Domini;* behold the handmaid of the Lord. It will cost me everything God exacts, all the blood of my Son and all my motherly tears to lead Him from the cradle to the cross. Here I am; I accept: *Ecce ancilla Domini;* behold the handmaid of the Lord."

---

[1] *Luke* 1:26-38.

[2] *Isaias* 53:5.

Freely and lovingly Mary consented to become the Mother of the Saviour of men; she united herself to Him in the purest of all loves in order to effect under Him and with Him the Redemption of mankind, by martyrdom and by blood.

Our Lady adhered to the *redemptive* Incarnation, and to *all* the sorrows, sufferings, and labors it would involve. By her acceptance of the divine offer, she already began to play her rôle of co-operator in this, the mystery of the amorous restoration of a decaying humanity. Our Redemption, therefore, from the very instant of the Incarnation, takes on *a truly Marian character;* it will always bear the characteristic sign of Mary.

But there is more. The consent of the Virgin of Nazareth was indispensable to the redeeming Incarnation.[3] Had not God Himself decreed that the atonement for sin would be the work of His Son made man in the womb of a Virgin?

Could we not apply to Mary, by modifying them a little, the words by which the Church, on Easter-eve, extols the grandeur of Christ? *O certe necessarium Adae peccatum. . . . O felix culpa!* Let us sing the same sentiments of gratitude and of admiration: *O certe necessarius Mariae consensus, qui talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem!*

If Jesus is the Son of her womb, He is first of all the fruit of her love and of her consent. If our Redemption proceeds essentially and principally from the Redeemer, Christ, it is also dependent, although secondarily, upon Mary and her adherence to the word of the angel Gabriel. For, in truth, without Mary, no Incarnation, no Redemption, no salvation. We rely upon Mary for those graces which are offered to us at every instant and which we *need* to conquer heaven. Without Mary's influence, would we have received the grace of Baptism or those of the other sacraments? Deprived of this *Marian* assistance, would we be capable of living Christianly and of expending ourselves for our fellow-man? Our personal sanctification, our self-sacrifice, our priestly zeal for souls or our apostolate in Catholic Action depend upon Mary! But for Adam's sin, no Incarnation, but also no Mary, no Christ, no reparation, no grace! In the face of such a noble kindness, in the presence of such a benefactress we can give voice to the joy of our hearts: "*O felix culpa!* Oh! Blissful trespass which procured for us such a sublime co-Redeemer."

---

[3] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 30, a. 1.

(II) *On Calvary, the union of Mary to the immolation of her Son procures for the Redemption a Marian character.*

Jesus, as we sing it in the Credo of the Mass, was born *for* the cross; He lived *for* the cross; He died *on* the cross. That supreme objective, which He contemplated unceasingly and continuously pursued during the thirty-three years of His terrestrial life, attracted the first transports of His heart. He scarcely received the blood, which Mary so lovingly gave Him, before he *wanted* to shed it for us. At the dawn of His life, He offered Himself to His Father: "No sacrifice, no offering was thy demand; thou hast endowed me, instead, with a body. . . . I said, See, my God, I am coming to do thy will." In accordance with this divine will, St. Paul notes, we have been sanctified by an offering made once for all, the body of Jesus Christ.[4]

And all of the Saviour's life on earth was to be inspired by that initial abandonment, by that thirst for martyrdom, by that need of shedding His blood on the cross. "There is a baptism I must needs be baptized with," He said to His Apostles, "and how impatient am I for its accomplishment!" Only the immolation on Calvary was to have the power of quenching that burning thirst and enable Him to make known to men the sentiments of His heart and the purpose of His advent among them. *Consummatum est!* All is achieved! God is glorified, man is redeemed.

Those sacrificial dispositions of the God-Man, constantly active and manifested with so much heroism on Golgotha, were likewise the intimate sentiments of Mary.

By her consent she became the Mother of Jesus, future propitiatory victim: she lived in order to nourish and prepare that Host of sacrifice; she immolated It finally on Calvary. One sole love animated the Son and the Mother, the Redeemer and the coredeemer; one motive activated them; to suffer and to die for the glory of God and the redemption of the world. One thought, one desire, one heart impelled both of them towards the redemptive cross. If we count here two persons, we cannot distinguish a duality of objectives or of sentiments; on the contrary, we can discern but one end and one sole charity. With Jesus, the flesh of her flesh, the blood of her blood, Mary could say while contemplating the cross of salvation: "There is a baptism I must needs be baptized with, and how impatient am I for its accomplishment."[5]

---

[4] Cf. *Heb.*, 10:5-8, 10.

From the moment of the Incarnation, and particularly after the Presentation of the Child Jesus in the Temple, having heard Simeon tell her that a sword of grief would pierce her soul, Mary knew that in her Son she was preparing the Host of the redemptive sacrifice. What is more, like Jesus, she never took her eyes off the bloody cross of Golgotha. Came the hour for the holocaust; and her love, stronger than her anguish, led her to the very foot of the cross. Standing like a priest at the altar, partaking of those sacerdotal and sacrificial dispositions of Christ, united to and as if identified with Him, so great was her desire, as His, to accomplish the divine will, a Mother—Mary—immolated her Son, she offered Him to God *for us.* And, as He yielded up His spirit, with Him, she said: *"Consummatum est;* all is achieved!" How can we help but cry out in the face of such grandeur and generosity and heroism? Mary loved the world to such a degree that she gave us her only Son. Our salvation, then, is the fruit of one love; it is the common labor of Jesus and Mary, of the Son and His Mother, who has become our Mother.

The Redemption is certainly marked with the sign of Mary; it carries within itself a maternal note, a Marian character. Such were the designs of God. And that Marian character teaches us that we cannot attain Christ, the Redeemer, without the intervention of the coredeemer; we cannot come near to the cross if we do not partake of the salutary sorrows of Mary.

This doctrine, so firmly based on Holy Scripture, reproduces the most authentic teachings of the Sovereign Pontiffs, especially since Leo XIII and Pius X.

---

[5] *Luke* 12:50.

Associated with Jesus from the very moment of the Incarnation for the Redemption of mankind, Mary, at every instant of her existence and by all of her actions, co-operated in this work of salvation. But the martyrdom of her compassion on Calvary marked the apex, the culminating point of her contribution. "It is not only to the glory of the Virgin," writes Pius X, "that she furnished the substance of her flesh for God's only Son . . . and by so doing prepared a victim for the salvation of men; but, what is more, her mission was to guard this victim, to nourish it and to present it at the altar on the appointed day."[6]

Benedict XV speaks to us in a like manner: "By uniting herself to the Passion and death of her Son, [Mary] suffered almost unto death . . . in order to appease divine justice; as much as she could, she immolated her Son, in such a way that we can say she redeemed mankind with Him."[7]

According to Pius XI, the Virgin ". . . was chosen as the Mother of Christ so that she might be made to participate in the Redemption of mankind."[8]

"It was Mary," Pius XII teaches, "who, always so narrowly united to her Son, presented Him to the Eternal Father on Golgotha for all of Adam's sons who carry the blemish of the original sin."[9]

Since we are redeemed by Christ under the sign of Mary, our Mother, for us to establish our spiritual life outside of the Virgin's influence would be in vain. God's decrees and the dispositions of Divine Providence will always conserve their Marian exigencies. Mary's redeeming mission does not end with the death of her Son but it must be prolonged until the very last chosen one is crowned. So that our personal lives may reach new summits, and our apostolate gain its maximum spiritual yield, we must act under our heavenly Mother's protection, we must march under her banner and guidance. Our Redemption carries the seal of Mary. May our daily lives always reflect her image and one day be transformed into glory—and for all eternity!

AUGUSTE FERLAND, S.S.
The Grand Seminary of Montreal
Montreal, Canada

---

[6] Encyclical *Ad diem illum* (Feb. 2, 1904).
[7] Apostolic Letter, *Inter sodalicia* (March 22, 1918).
[8] *Osservatore romano*, April 29, 1935.
[9] Encyclical, *Mystici Corporis* (June 22, 1943).

THE PRIEST AND MR. BLANSHARD'S BOOK

In the spring of 1949 the Beacon Press of Boston published a book entitled *American Freedom and Catholic Power,* the author of which is Mr. Paul Blanshard. The book is a vehement attack on the Catholic Church, and undoubtedly has done much harm to Catholics and to Catholicism. For several months after publication it was reckoned as one of the "best sellers," and although the number of sales has now diminished, it is safe to say that it will be read for many years to come. Beyond doubt the number of those who have already read this book totals up to several millions.

Catholics are accustomed to being the object of such attacks. In our own land there has been a continuous succession of anti-Catholic periodicals, such as *The Protestant Vindicator, The American Crusader, The Patriotic American, The Fellowship Forum,* etc., down to our own day, when we have such publications as *The Converted Catholic* and *The Convert.*[1] Books and articles innumerable aimed at discrediting the Catholic Church have been published in the course of the last century and a half, ranging in intellectual calibre from such lurid trash as *The Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk* (1835) to the courteous letter of Mr. Charles Marshall to Governor Alfred E. Smith in the *Atlantic Monthly* (1928), arguing that a Catholic could not conscientiously fulfil the office of President of the United States. Probably ninety per cent of the charges against the Church contained in these numerous written attacks center about the claim that Catholics are disloyal to the principles of American democracy and are endeavoring to gain political control in our land.

Mr. Blanshard follows the same pattern. In his prologue he asserts that the hierarchy of the Catholic Church "uses the political power of some twenty-six million official American Catholics to bring American foreign policy into line with Vatican temporal interests."[2] In many other points also he follows the beaten track of the enemies of the Church in the United States. He ridicules the Index of Forbidden Books.[3] He derides the sacred rites of the

---

[1] Cf. M. Williams, *The Shadow of the Pope* (New York, 1932), 61 ff.

[2] P. Blanshard, *American Freedom and Catholic Power* (Boston, 1949), 4.

[3] *Ibid.,* 182 ff.

Catholic Church, such as the Mass and the Sacrament of Penance.[4] He brings up the case of Galileo.[5] He casts discredit on Catholic education.[6] He denounces the Catholic Church because it does not give the members of the laity a voice in its administration.[7] In connection with this last charge it is interesting to see the similarity between Mr. Blanshard's words and those of Samuel F. B. Morse in a work entitled *A Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States*, which was published about 1833—and which, by the way, helped its author to support himself while he was working on the telegraph:

> Do Popish bishops or priests consult the people? Have the people any voice in ecclesiastical matters? Can the people vote their own taxes, or are they imposed on them by irresponsible priests? Do the bishops and priests account for the manner in which they spend the people's money? Has Popery here adopted the American principles of responsibility to the people; a responsibility which gives the most insignificant contributor of his money toward any object a right to examine into the manner in which it is disbursed? No! the people account to their priests in all cases, not the priests in any case.[8]

Generally speaking, therefore, Mr. Blanshard copies the methods of the many enemies of the Church who have found the publication of anti-Catholic literature a profitable venture in the United States. However, there are certain features of *American Freedom and Catholic Power* which distinguish it from most writings of its kind, and it is well for priests, who may be asked about this book, to know something about these characteristics and to be prepared to reply to the objections they may engender.

In the first place, this book has the appearance of being a most scholarly and exact work. Thirty pages at the end of the book are devoted to footnotes, more than 450 in number. Some of these are mere citations, others contain lengthy quotations. Mr. Blanshard emphasizes this notion, for in the prologue he tells us that he has had the assistance of some of the most distinguished and scholarly critics who ever united in the attempt to make a book factually im-

[4] *Ibid.*, 36.

[5] *Ibid.*, 212.

[6] *Ibid.*, 59 ff.

[7] *Ibid.*, 15.

[8] Quoted in *The Shadow of the Pope*, 69.

pregnable.[9] And, writing in the Vermont newspaper *The Public Opinion,* on November 25, 1949, he asserted: "I am happy and proud to say that after perhaps the heaviest barrage of criticism ever directed against a book in the history of the American Catholic press, no substantial fact in my book has been successfully challenged." This alleged feature of the work has won high praise from some of the critics. Thus, according to the book-jacket, Dr. John Haynes Holmes says that it is "accurate, sound in argument, objective in spirit—a solid piece of work, if I ever saw one." I wonder how many of the references Dr. Holmes checked for accuracy.

Secondly, Mr. Blanshard makes frequent use of Catholic sources, including a considerable number which are scientifically of great weight, such as the Code of Canon Law, Bouscaren's *Canon Law Digest,* Davis' *Moral and Pastoral Theology, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Homiletic and Pastoral Review,* Gasparri's *Catholic Catechism,* etc. This helps to give the impression that he is perfectly objective and trustworthy in his presentation of Catholic belief and practice.

Thirdly, Mr. Blanshard endeavors in his book to make his readers believe that there is a cleavage between the hierarchy of the Catholic Church and the people. Thus, he states: "Essentially the Catholic problem in America is what to do with the hierarchy of the Roman Church. The American Catholic *people* have done their best to join the rest of America, but the American Catholic hierarchy, as we shall see in the course of this survey, has never been assimilated."[10] I am not quite sure as to what Mr. Blanshard means by the "hierarchy"—whether he includes priests in this category, or only bishops. I am of the opinion that he uses the word in this latter meaning for in one passage he makes a distinction between the hierarchy and what he calls "the lower clergy."[11] In any event, he is anxious to give the impression that the laity of the Catholic Church are being kept in subjection by the clergy, and that if they could assert themselves, things would be quite different in the

---

[9] *American Freedom and Catholic Power,* 7. Among the "distinguished scholars" are several ex-priests, and an anonymous individual designated as "a leading American Catholic author."

[10] *Ibid.,* 10.

[11] *Ibid.,* 23.

Church. In fact, he makes the astounding assertion, when speaking about the decree of papal infallibility in 1870, that "there is little doubt that if the whole question could have been discussed freely and voted on by the Catholic *people* of the world, they would have repudiated the doctrine, and possibly the Papacy along with it."[12]

Now, in view of these particular features of *American Freedom and Catholic Power,* what should be the reply of the priest who is questioned about this book—perhaps by sincere non-Catholics who have read it and are impressed by these characteristics?

As for the "scholarship" of the work, ostensibly demonstrated by its wealth of citations, it is well for the priest to know that actually a considerable number of blatantly false statements are concealed under this appearance of exactness. For example, Mr. Blanshard cites the *Catholic News* of New York in support of his claim that in 1948 the Catholic Church in America planned a ten-billion dollar program of construction (which he says would mean, if paid by contributions, an average levy of $385 from every Catholic man, woman and child).[13] Now, anyone who looks up the issue of the *Catholic News* he cites will find that the amount stated for the planned program of construction is actually one-thirtieth of the figure given by Mr. Blanshard (and consequently $13 instead of the staggering figure given by Mr. Blanshard in his endeavor to prove that "frequently the priests go to great extremes in their campaign for building funds, even in the parishes of the poor"). Again, Mr. Blanshard states that in 1935 several Catholic writers were obliged to sign a retraction of their views concerning the eternity of hell, and asserts that in this retraction they were obliged to admit that there is *real* fire in hell.[14] Anyone who will look up this retraction, cited by Mr. Blanshard, will see that it made no mention of *real fire.* (I am not concerned here with the doctrine on this point that must be held by Catholics. I am concerned only with the "factual assertion" of Mr. Blanshard in reference to a particular incident, since it illustrates the unreliability of his "scholarship.").

One of the most unpardonable of the misrepresentations in this book is the statement that according to Catholic doctrine the marriage of two Protestants is not a sacrament.[15] Mr. Blanshard had available Catholic books of information, informing him clearly that the Catholic Church regards as a sacramental union every valid marriage of two baptized persons, whether they be Catholics or non-Catholics. Hence, it is hard to realize how he could have made this erroneous statement in good faith.

---

[12] *Ibid.,* 23.

[13] *Ibid.,* 12.

[14] *Ibid.,* 34.

[15] *Ibid.,* 156 ff.

The book contains many wide statements given without any proof, statements which every intelligent person familiar with the Catholic Church will recognize as false, although it would require an extensive treatise to prove that they are wrong. For example, Mr. Blanshard says: "The general tendency of the hierarchy is to nullify a non-Catholic marriage as swiftly and graciously as possible if a noted person is thereby won over to the Church or held within the Church. . . .[16] "The twisted and bizarre principles of the Catholic sexual code cannot be explained in rational terms. . . ."[17] "There is almost no type of marriage that cannot be annulled somehow under the complex rules of the Catholic marriage courts if a determined spouse is willing and able to go to the expense of a prolonged litigation and uses sufficient patience and ingenuity in constructing a plausible case."[18] Of course, ignorant and biased readers of Mr. Blanshard's book will take such statements at face value and it would be useless to quote for their benefit: *Quod gratis asseritur, gratis negatur.* But it is possible that a priest will be questioned on these charges by some one who is intelligent and fair, and will have the opportunity to point out the unfairness of those who make these sweeping statements without any basis of proof.

Mr. Blanshard's use of Catholic sources, which may give those unfamiliar with Catholic teaching the idea that he has correctly represented Catholic teaching, only furnishes him with another opportunity of spreading his misrepresentations. For example, he cites Canon 2101 to prove that "the discussion of the virtues of a proposed saint does not ordinarily begin until at least fifty years after his death."[19] Of course, as any one familiar with the law of the Church realizes, the Canon in question is concerned with the *Roman* process, which presupposes a thorough investigation of the holy person's life, usually conducted by the bishop shortly after the individual's death. In support of his contention that a Protestant marriage is not a sacrament according to Catholic belief he quotes a passage from Fr. Davis referring not to the marriage of Protestants, but to the marriage of unbaptized persons.[20] He quotes from a declaration of the bishops of England and Wales to prove that, according to Catholic teaching, the Catholic public school teacher must be mindful of her moral responsibility to the Church, when actually the bishops were speaking of the teacher's responsibility to the parents of the children placed in her charge.[21] His interpretation of Canon 747 is utterly absurd and insulting.[22]

---

[16] *Ibid.*, 178.

[17] *Ibid.*, 154.

[18] *Ibid.*, 171.

[19] *Ibid.*, 220.

These are but a few of the false statements appearing in Mr. Blanshard's book. It is strange that there have even been Catholics who apparently did not realize how many inaccuracies it contains, and have been willing to concede that Mr. Blanshard tried to present facts fairly and objectively. Thus, writing in the *Catholic World*, Mr. J. L. Benvenisti says that "Paul Blanshard's *American Freedom and Catholic Power* is the book of a painstaking and intelligent man who has honestly tried to avoid actual falsehood, who most certainly eschews outright calumny and even, within his limits, tries to be fair.[23]

A more objective evaluation of this book is that which appears from the pen of Professor William Brickman, of New York University. After pointing out some examples of Mr. Blanshard's method of "employing the double standard of criticism and the technique of imparting partial truths by withholding evidence contrary to his opinions," Dr. Brickman adds:

> There are more instances of misrepresentation, fragmentary information and one-sided criticism, but it would be tedious to multiply instances. If the rest of the volume is as vulnerable, as the chapters on education, then Blanshard may be charged with shoddy scholarship, if not indeed with outright religious bias.[24]

In order to offset the idea that Mr. Blanshard's writings may give to non-Catholics about the relations existing between the hierarchy and the laity of the Catholic Church, we must let our well-meaning non-Catholic friends know that the implication that the Catholic people are kept in subjugation by a domineering hierarchy is utterly ridiculous, to put it mildly. As a group, the Catholics of the United States co-operate loyally and cheerfully with the policies of the bishops and the Sovereign Pontiff. The claim that our people would gladly get rid of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope or of the Pope himself, if they could express their wishes, is too absurd to call for any serious consideration, as far as Catholics are concerned. Yet, in view of the charges made so brazenly by Mr. Blanshard, it might be well for a priest, if he is called on to discuss the book with non-Catholics, to set them straight on this point.

---

[20] *Ibid.*, 161, note 8.

[21] *Ibid.*, 83.

[22] *Ibid.*, 110.

[23] *Catholic World*, April, 1950, p. 14.

[24] William W. Brickman, "The School and the Church-State Question," *School and Society*, Vol. 71, n. 1846 (May 6, 1950), 279.

The favorable reception given to this book in many quarters reminds us emphatically that the spirit of hostility to the Catholic Church still flourishes in the United States. There are millions of our fellow citizens who dislike and distrust the Catholic Church. On the other hand, there are many fair-minded non-Catholics to whom Paul Blanshard's attack may be the occasion of giving a hearing to the Catholic claims. Certainly there have been reviews of the book by non-Catholic writers which showed a very fair attitude. Thus, Mr. T. Robert Ingram, a former newspaperman and naval officer, now a candidate for the Episcopalian ministry, says:

> Responsible Protestant leaders have been unable to identify themselves with the spirit of Blanshard's book. They admit it is heavily and impressively documented; but there is nothing in it with which they have not been familiar with in one way or another. . . . Blanshard's book is only one indication of widespread confusion and concern over the whole question of church-state relationship in the United States. . . . For all his impressive "documentation" Blanshard does not help to clarify the issue, but seems rather to confound confusion.[25]

The most practical lesson taught to Catholics, especially to priests, by this book of Paul Blanshard is the necessity of taking a vigorously aggressive attitude toward the attacks on the Catholic Church. Catholics as a group are a peace-loving people; and too often they content themselves with a merely defensive response to the charges brought against them and their faith. It is one of the tactics of Mr. Blanshard to provoke this attitude. He makes a sweeping, unproved statement; then calls for an answer, demand-ing that we repeat at great length what has been said many times previously. The proper way to undertake a rebuttal to this book and others of its kind is to point out the errors, the lack of logic, the distortions of truth with which they are laden. In the case of some anti-Catholic literature this can be done adequately by an analysis of the text itself; in the case of *American Freedom and Catholic Power* an examination of the author's "documentation" is called for. But I can assure anyone who takes the pains to look up the citations that an astounding number of them are misrepresented and twisted out of context in the text.

---

[25] *Atlantic Monthly,* Feb., 1950, p. 75.

And so, Mr. Blanshard's book is simply one more addition to the series of biased attacks to which Catholics have long been accustomed. Behind its array of citations and its pretence to objective presentation of facts is the old spirit of bigotry that has never yielded to the spirit of American fair play. And while we have a feeling of pity for those who allow their hatred for the true Church of Christ to blind them in this way, we must not regard it as alien to the spirit of Christian charity to attack them vigorously in return and to point out their inconsistencies and fallacies. Perhaps if we followed this method more generally we should be more successful in making converts to the Catholic Church in America.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

A WARNING AGAINST GULLIBILITY

Whatever new truth the sincere human mind is able to find certainly cannot be opposed to truth already acquired, since God, the Highest Truth, has created the human intellect and guides it, not that it may daily oppose new truths to rightly established ones, but rather that, having eliminated errors which may have crept in, it may build truth upon truth in the same order and structure that exist in reality, the source of truth.

Let no Christian therefore, whether philosopher or theologian, embrace eagerly and lightly whatever novelty happens to be thought up from day to day, but rather let him weigh it with painstaking care and a balanced judgment, lest he lose or corrupt the truth he already has, with grave danger and damage to his faith.

His Holiness Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical *Humani generis.*

THE MARIOLOGY OF ST. THOMAS

The recent and very impressive development of Marian doctrine has leaned heavily on the mediaeval Scholastics. Names like St. Albert, St. Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus are great landmarks in Mariology; while among the mediaeval preachers of Mary, St. Bernard is towering. It would be strange if the greatest of them all, St. Thomas Aquinas, had no contribution to make; all the more strange since he was the disciple of Albert, the Marian Doctor and, in his own devotional life, most deeply attached to the holy Virgin. We shall attempt in these pages very briefly to indicate in a positive way what the content of St. Thomas' Mariology is, and what possible contribution it may make to our own deeper penetration of the theology of our Lady.

In this, two extremes are very obviously to be avoided. The first would be an attempt to read into Saint Thomas more than is there, to try to make him say what he does not actually say. The second would be a dismissal of the greatest of the doctors as inconsequential and unimportant in our contemporary endeavor to deepen our understanding of our Lady. Both extremes are avoidable by the very honest device of sticking fast to the text of St. Thomas, and examining it as it stands. In these pages, then, no claim is advanced that St. Thomas ever elaborated a systematic and complete Mariology. Such a claim would be absurd. These points alone are made: (1) the great mariological truths were known to St. Thomas and taught by him, and (2) St. Thomas can give to present-day development of Mariology an invaluable directive principle. In developing both points, recourse is had not to what the holy Doctor would have taught or might have taught, but only to what he did actually teach.

There are three main considerations about the Virgin Mother of God:

(1) Her own fulness of sanctity, a fulness by reason of which she was indeed the worthy Mother of God.

(2) Her relation to God; and here it is, of course, her Divine Maternity which is the essential consideration.

(3) Her relation to us as our Mother, Mediatrix and Queen.

St. Thomas treats each of these considerations with a fulness which is not universally appreciated. In his most properly Mariological work—his brief Commentary on the Ave Maria—he considers each of the three successively. Following his example we can ally each consideration to one part of heaven's own greeting to our Blessed Lady: "Hail, full of grace; the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women."

"Hail, full of grace." Of old, writes St. Thomas, it was a great thing indeed that Angels should appear to men; those men were honored indeed who were privileged to reverence Angels. But this was utterly unheard of, that an Angel should bow low in reverence before one of our race; unheard of until Mary, unheard of until Gabriel recognized in her the superior of all Angels. And whence this superiority, this right even to the reverence of God's ministers? In answer the Angelic Doctor treats of the first point in Marian doctrine; he delineates something of her fulness of grace, her richness of personal sanctity.

Our Lady's sanctity he conceives in two ways: for the grace of God he sees as having a two-fold purpose, the one negative, namely, the avoidance of sin; the other positive, namely, that we might act rightly. As to both, Our Lady's grace was perfect. Negatively, she was farther from sin than any other saint, he writes, save Christ alone.[1] This same truth is expressed several times elsewhere in the writings of St. Thomas; thus in his *Summa theologica* he says "Under Christ, Mary's purity from sin was the greatest"[2] and again, he writes that Our Lady must have been sinless because the Mother of God must be brilliantly pure.[3] St. Thomas notes with St. John that all men are sinners—all, he says, but Mary. Of her alone is it true that she sinned neither mortally nor venially.[4] In her, alone of our race, are fulfilled the words of the Canticle *Tota pulchra es, amica mea, et macula non est in te*."[5]

Not only was she free from sin, she was even above all inclination to sin[6] so that in her there was not even any temptation to sin from her most pure flesh.[7] More than that, in his Commentary on the Ave Maria St. Thomas states that Mary was free even of all penalty for sin, completely delivered from that ancient curse "in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children . . . in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread . . . into dust thou shalt return."[8]

---

[1] Cf. *Expositio super . . . Ave Maria.*
[2] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 27, a. 2, ad 2.
[3] Cf. *ibid.*, I-II, q. 81, a. 1, ad 5.
[4] Cf. *ibid.*, III, q. 27, a. 6, ad 1.
[5] Cf. *ibid.*, a. 4.
[6] Cf. *loc. cit.;* also *ibid.*, a. 6, ad 1.
[7] Cf. *ibid.*, a. 3.

But the Angel's words "Hail full of grace" signify more than Our Lady's sinlessness; they acknowledge too a positive sanctity, a God-likeness which is surpassing. It would be difficult indeed to speak of the Virgin's holiness in terms more exact than those used by St. Thomas. "It is reasonable to believe that she who bore the only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth, received greater privileges of grace than all others."[9] And the holy Doctor goes on to clarify the reasons for this: "The closer anything approaches to a principle, so much more does it participate the effect of that principle. . . . But Christ is the principle of all grace . . . and the Blessed Virgin was closest of all to him" as His Mother.[10] She is the greatest after Him and under Him in sanctity. Her closeness to Him, as His Mother, is unique, shared by none; so, too, the greatness of her grace consonant with that motherhood. We should mention here that St. Thomas distinguishes, as theologians commonly do, a three-fold sanctification of Our Lady: (a) a dispositive fulness by which she was rendered suitable to be the Mother of God; (b) a new perfection with which she was adorned at the Incarnation—for surely the substantial personal presence of the Word within her was a sanctifying presence; and (c) her fulness of glory.[11] Most of what St. Thomas says of the sanctity of the Blessed Virgin he clearly understands of her first sanctification, in preparation for her motherhood. Of the subsequent increases in holiness he speaks, but speaks briefly. It is as though, since the first itself beggars description, then *a fortiori* the more perfect growth in holiness defies adequate explanation.

All students of Mary in seeking to express the perfection of God's Mother are ensnared by the very meagerness of our words, so they frequently resort to comparisons between Our Lady and all other Saints, in order to express comparatively an absolute thing which is too great for us to grasp absolutely. St. Thomas, too, resorts to this device. In one of his sermons for the feast of the Purification he writes, "This temple of God [Mary] is wondrous above all Saints. . . . She had more of faith and charity than any other creature. . . . Everything in the Virgin was wholly sanctified. . . . She was enriched with the virtue of all Saints and all Angels . . . and endowed with this great privilege that all sinners and all evil-doers who should whole-heartedly fly to Her should be saved . . . that all prayers which are poured forth to Her should be heard."[12] Was she endowed then with the gifts of the Holy Ghost? St. Thomas answers in the *Summa* with a clear affirmative: the Gifts of the Holy Ghost were hers and, more than that, even the *gratiae gratis datae,* the charismatic gifts—not, he adds, that she actually used all of these latter, but she did have all.[13]

---

[8] *Gen.* 3:16-19.

[9] *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 27, a. 1.

[10] *Ibid.*, a. 5.

[11] Cf. *loc. cit.*, ad 2.

Our Lady, St. Thomas writes in his Commentary on the Ave Maria, not only had all graces and all virtues; she *used* them (with the exception of those, the use of which would have been unfitting her state and sex). For he continues, "she performed works of every virtue. Other Saints perform special works of some virtues; for one was humble, another chaste, a third merciful, and so they are given as examples of special virtues. But the Blessed Virgin is an example of all." He returns again to this truth, expressing it in most striking language in one of his sermons on the Assumption.[14] The Virgin, he says, is exalted as the Angels, the Patriarchs, and Prophets, the Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors and Virgins . . . for she was exalted above the choirs of Angels, and above all Saints. She had the merit of Angels by living angelically; she had the merit of the prophet in prophesying, for she foretold that all generations should call her blessed; she had the merit of the Apostles and Evangelists by teaching (though St. Thomas notes elsewhere that she did not teach publicly[15]); the merit of martyrs by suffering the death of the Cross with her Son; the merit of Confessors by devoutedly praising God; the merit of virgins by preserving virginity. "Yes," he adds, "she had the merit of them all—and more besides." *Habuit meritum omnium—et amplius.* Is not this teaching clear? Not only was God's Blessed Mother endowed with all graces; she made such use of them as to render to God greater worship, greater service, greater love than that of all Angels and Saints. Human words, without resorting to exaggeration and unfitting phrases, can hardly express better than Thomas' words the fulness of grace, the fulness of sanctity of Our Lady.

---

[12] *Sermones . . . festivae . . . ,* n. 23.

[13] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 27, a. 5, ad 3.

[14] Cf. *Serm. fest.,* n. 58.

[15] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 27, a. 5, ad 3.

Thomas continues, in his Commentary on the Ave Maria: "She was full of grace also as to the overflowing, so to say, from her soul into her body. For this is a great thing found in the Saints—to have so much grace that their souls are sanctified; but so full of grace was the holy Virgin that grace flowed forth into her flesh, that from it she might conceive the Son of God."

Mariologists, as a rule, consider two personal prerogatives of our Lady as being, so to say, manifestations in her body of that exalted sanctity which characterize her soul. These two are (a) her matchless virginity and (b) her glorious Assumption into heaven. That St. Thomas treats of these is most obvious. In his *Summa* he devotes an entire question—and a most beautiful and reverent question—to a consideration of Mary's spotless virginity.[16] This question stands really as a classic: and later authors in their speculative consideration of this prerogative often do no more than quote St. Thomas at length, for he has gathered here within four brief articles the wisdom of his predecessors in an unsurpassed tribute to the Blessed Virgin. Less widely known perhaps, but surely no less beautiful, is St. Thomas' reasoning on this same problem in his *Compendium Theologiae*.

> The more anyone is detached from the things of the flesh, the more such a person is filled with spiritual gifts. For man is raised up by spiritual goods, whereas he is dragged down by carnal attractions. Accordingly, since the formation of Christ's body was to be accomplished by the Holy Spirit, it behooved that woman from whom Christ took His Body to be filled to overflowing with spiritual gifts, so that not only would her soul be endowed with virtues . . . but her womb also made fruitful with divine offspring. Therefore, her soul had to be free from sin, and her body had to be far removed from every stain of concupiscence. And so she had no association with man.[17]

This reasoning is a most penetrating and sublime application of St. Thomas' position that Mary did indeed merit to be a worthy Mother of God; for the Angelic Doctor here, as also in his Commentary on the Ave Maria, pictures the perpetual virginity of our

---

[16] Cf. *ibid.*, q. 28.

[17] *Comp. theol.*, c. 221.

Lady as so glorious in the sight of the all-holy God that the excellence of that virginity, as it were, drew down God to her. So virginal was she that "her womb would be made fruitful with Divine offspring." Human words shall hardly describe more nobly Mary's perfect virginity.

Of the Blessed Mother's Assumption St. Thomas speaks less frequently, but not less clearly. Thus, in his Commentary on the Ave Maria in speaking of our Lady's freedom even from all penalty due to sin, he writes that from the penalty which is incineration, the returning unto dust, our Lady was freed by her Assumption into heaven. Twice in his *Summa* St. Thomas indicated this.[18] More frequently, however, he considers her Assumption under the aspect of her exaltation, her Queenship over all creation; and this we shall see shortly.

One final point must be made here. Throughout this question of our Lady's personal sanctity, under its every aspect, St. Thomas assigns but one reason for her ineffable plenitude of holiness. Always that reason is the same—the divine maternity. Considering her freedom from all sin, even from the penalties due to sin, St. Thomas in his Commentary on the Ave Maria assigns as the proximate reason for this freedom our Lady's first sanctification, i.e. that which preceded the divine Maternity. More explicitly in the *Summa* he gives as the reason for this freedom, and for the whole initial plenitude of Mary's sanctity, the divine Maternity.[19] Her predestination, her whole unique preparation are ordered to this. In that magnificent sermon on her purification, once again, it is her Motherhood of God that St. Thomas calls upon to explain such a miracle of holiness. *Ave gratia plena.* St. Thomas' position is clear; all Mary's holiness is ordered somehow to her office as Mother of God. She is full of grace, because she is indeed the Mother of Divine Grace.

The Holy Doctor considers next the Blessed Mother in her relation to God. And once again the key to this aspect of Mariology is to be found in heaven's own greeting to Mary. *Dominus tecum.* Here, too, St. Thomas is quick to point out the great fundamental source of the unique and most sacred way in which God is with Mary is, again, her divine maternity. God is, so to say, with her *par excellence;* for God is with her as the very fruit of her womb. This most noble dignity, this motherhood of God, is the key to our Lady's closeness to God.

---

[18] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 27, a. 1; q. 83, a. 5, ad 8.

[19] Cf. *ibid.*, q. 27, a. 1; a. 5.

And so St. Thomas in his Commentary on the Ave Maria writes that Mary is as familiar of God in a way that is true of no other creature. For God was with the Gabriel who spoke these words as a Lord is with his servant; but, writes St. Thomas, the Son of God is with her *in utero, cum ea ut filius.* And from this, of course, it follows that the whole Most Blessed Trinity is with Mary to a unique degree—God the Father as with His most beloved daughter, God the *Verbum* as her Son, God the Holy Ghost in her as in His temple; for it was said to her *Spiritus Sanctus superveniet in te.*

Under this general consideration of Mary in relation to God, Mariologists usually find it convenient to treat of three points: (a) Mary is the true Mother of Jesus; (b) Mary is the Mother of God; and (c) Mary is the Mother of the divine Redeemer as such. Here, again, as in the case of our Lady's virginity, it would be merely insisting on the obvious to point out that St. Thomas taught these truths and taught them most adequately. In four different works St. Thomas treats of the reality of Mary's Motherhood of Christ.[20] In six of his works he treats, most accurately and most reverently, of the reality of her Motherhood of God.[21] With respect to this latter he, like the Mariologists of our own day, is not content merely to show the fact; he indicates, too, something of the glorious dignity of this office. So, writing in his *Summa,* he notes that this dignity in itself is higher than that of the beatified angels who see the very face of God.[22] Again in the *Summa* he says that the Mother of God has "a certain infinite dignity from the infinite good which is God."[23] St. Thomas' doctrine on Mary the Mother of God can, perhaps, best be summarily characterized by saying that it is insistent, accurate, and complete; as insistent as the very words of Cyril on the reality of this truth; so accurate that theologians after St. Thomas are, as it were, relieved of any duty of devising arguments or vocabulary in this matter; so complete that subsequent theologians normally find it sufficient merely to develop St. Thomas' arguments, at least as to the theological explanation of the fact of the divine motherhood.

---

[20] Cf. *ibid.,* III, q. 35, a. 3; *In III lib. sent.,* d. 3, q. 2, a. 1; d. 4, q. 2, a. 1; *Contra Gent.,* IV, c. 34, 35; *Super epist. ad Gal.,* c. 4, 1. 2.

[21] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 35, a. 4; *In III lib. sent.,* d. 4, q. 2, a. 2; *Contra Gent.,* IV, c. 34, 45; *Comp. theol.* c. 222; *In evan. Matt.,* c. 1; *Super epist. ad Gal.,* c. 4, 1. 2.

[22] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 30, a. 2, ad 1.

[23] *Ibid.,* I, q. 25, a. 6, ad 4.

To the consideration of our Lady *in ordine ad Deum* it pertains, of course, to treat of her in relation to her divine Son. It is precisely here that one of the great difficulties in Mariology arises, precisely here, too, that St. Thomas' Mariology is most criticized as inadequate. The difficulty is this; adequately to appreciate our Lady's place in the economy of salvation—or even in history—it might seem that it is not enough to consider the Holy Virgin as Mother of Christ. We must consider her also as His associate, His helper; otherwise, very many theologians maintain, the prerogatives of Our Lady as our coredemptrix under Christ, as mediatrix under Christ, can not be appreciated. For the fact of being Mother of Christ does not necessarily include in its formal connotation being the helper of Christ in his redemptive work. From this the criticism of St. Thomas follows inevitably; he has considered Our Lady merely in her role as Mother of Christ, Mother of God. Therefore, one very beautiful and important aspect of Marian theology is closed to him. The charge is made seriously and St. Thomas' Marian doctrine in the *Summa* alleged in support of it.

We must admit that, in his *Summa*, St. Thomas' doctrine about our Lady is incomplete. There he considers her merely in her preparation for and actual co-operation in the coming of Christ among us at His Incarnation. But surely we must judge what was the content of St. Thomas' Mariology from the totality of his writings. And in those writings the Holy Doctor does teach that Mary was to her Son an associate; that she is, indeed, the new Eve whose place in our redemption is remarkably antithetical to that of the first Eve in our enslavement. One half of St. Thomas' Commentary on the Ave Maria is an explication of the doctrine of Mary as the new Eve. Thomas knew and knew well that Mary's work did not end at the nativity, nor even at the beginning of our Saviour's public life. He knew well and taught clearly our Lady's co-operation in the work of her Son, who was God. For

St. Thomas did not merely know the familiar Eve-Mary antithesis in general fashion. He delineates too in some detail its implications. And here St. Thomas speaks with utmost delicacy. Both in the *Summa*[24] and in the Commentary on the Sentences[25] he speaks of the Incarnation as an indissoluble spiritual marriage of divine and human nature, a marriage to which the consent of the holy Virgin was requisite; for in her the marriage was achieved. Most surely in this St. Thomas is teaching us that Mary was bound to Christ by an everlasting love; that in her very consent to the divine maternity was involved a loving and enduring association in all that should ensue. In this doctrine of Mary's enduring association with Christ is involved all that contemporary Mariologists seek to establish; for in her, St. Thomas says, human nature entered into indissoluble marriage with God; and always it is proper to spouses that they work together, though never in equality.

But even more particularly the Angelic Doctor expressly teaches that prerogative which lies at the very heart of Our Lady's association in Christ's work. That prerogative is her Compassion, her sharing with Christ of what was His hour, His work. Mary is Christ's associate chiefly in His Passion; and of that association St. Thomas speaks clearly, penetratingly. Thus in one of his sermons based on Simeon's words to our Lady, "Thine own soul a sword shall pierce," he points out that among the things contained in this prophecy, "The first is the great compassion of the Blessed Virgin."[26] Again, in another sermon, he says strikingly that Mary suffered the death of the cross with Christ *(mortem crucis cum filio patiendo)*.[27] Surely this is a clear, unequivocal statement of St. Thomas' doctrine.

Now how does St. Thomas conclude to the prerogatives of our Lady under the aspect of her relation to God? We have indicated that some Marian students insist on another Mariological principle really distinct from her Motherhood of God, by no means reducible to it. This second principle of Mariology is that Mary is the *socia* of Christ, or the new Eve.

---

[24] Cf. *ibid.*, III, q. 30, a. 1.

[25] *In III lib. sent.*, d. 3, q. 3, a. 1, qa. 1.

[26] *Sermones . . . dominicales*, n. 15

[27] Cf. *Serm. fest.*, n. 58.

St. Thomas' critics are quite correct in saying that he posits no such principle distinct from the divine maternity. But bear in mind that with that one principle he did know and explain the Eve-Mary antithesis. It is in explanation of the words, "Blessed is the fruit of thy womb" that he most beautifully draws out this analogy. Again, when he speaks of Mary's conjunction with God being after the manner of a marriage, he describes this as being, precisely, the Incarnation, that is, Mary's Motherhood under one aspect. One can not say that in every place where St. Thomas considers Mary's association with Christ's work that he explicitly places the divine maternity as the very principle of that association. In his sermons, he seems merely to indicate a fact rather than to account for the fact; and in a sermon that is hardly surprising. But this much is true; wherever St. Thomas does indicate an underlying principle of Mary's association with Christ's work, that principle is her motherhood of Christ. Actually, in his Commentary on St. John's Gospel,[28] the holy Doctor twice seems to indicate that Mary's very motherhood is itself ordained to Calvary, is ordained to and actually includes her character as co-redemptrix. In both these places he points out that when Our Lord spoke to His Mother at Cana of Galilee He made no reference to her as His Mother; but on Calvary He acknowledged her. St. Thomas writes that the Redeemer's words at the wedding feast were equivalent to His saying "That in virtue of which I work miracles I have not received from you, but when I shall suffer according to that which I have received from you [human nature], then I shall recognize you." Mary's motherhood then is, according to St. Thomas, divinely ordained to be recognized on Calvary; it is a motherhood having actual ordination to her Compassion, as it had to His Passion. The very parental bond which united Mary to Christ has intrinsic ordination to the redemptive Passion. So Mary's motherhood is, in God's Providence, a co-redemptive, a con-suffering motherhood.

Such an interpretation makes it possible for us to see in one simple principle, Mary's place in our redemption. *Dominius tecum.* Truly the Lord was with her, with her most fundamentally because she is His true Mother. From this there follows that He is not separated from her in His redemptive work.

---

[28] *In evan. Joan.*, c. 2, 1. 4, n. 1; c. 19, 1. 4, n. 10.

Benedicta tu in mulieribus. Mary is, indeed, blessed among women, blessed above all others. Under this part of Heaven's greeting to Mary, we can properly consider her in her relation to us; consider those prerogatives of hers which bind us to her with strongest ties. And St. Thomas, considering this phrase in his Commentary on the Ave Maria, sums up in a few terse sentences all that is to be said under this heading. "Not only was she pure in herself, she also obtained purity for all others." In the same place he writes, "She alone carried benediction and opened the gates of heaven. Christians are directed by Mary to the glory to which she leads us." In the same Commentary, St. Thomas had already said, "To have grace sufficient for the salvation of all men . . . is indeed a maximum. This is in Christ and in the Blessed Virgin. In every danger, in every good action you can have her for helper."

In their doctrine of Our Lady in her gracious relationship to us, Mariologists treat really one fundamental fact but under several aspects. The fact is that the holy Virgin is to us a true principle of our sanctification and salvation. Because of this we can consider Mary as our Mother, our Mediatrix, and our Queen; our Mother, in the supernatural life, insofar as such life comes to us through her; our Mediatrix insofar as she obtains that life for us from God; our Queen insofar as in a secondary way she participates from Christ a certain authority over us in this supernatural life. But these various formalities, these distinct titles would all seem to designate a basic reality which is, materially speaking, one—Mary's principality with respect to us in the life of grace.

Now this final aspect of Mariology is exposed by St. Thomas in strong and loving words, a fact which does not surprise us in one as devoted to Our Lady as he was. In St. Thomas' writings only once does the term "Our Mother" seem to occur, and that is in his moving plea to Our Lady in which he invokes her as the "Mother of all believers." But the reality designated by this title "Mother of men" is most certainly taught by St. Thomas Thus, in one of his sermons considering Our Lady as a true principle of our justification, he explains, "She is endowed with this great privilege that all sinners, all evil-doers, who whole-heartedly hasten to her are saved . . . and all prayers which are poured forth to her are heard. . . . Come, let us go confidently to this temple of grace that we may find mercy."[29] In another sermon (31) Thomas compares the Virgin *(virgo)* to the rod *(virga)* which Christ used to produce grace from the stone, and he continues "through her we overcome the devil; through her we beseech the divine clemency; through her we are delivered from the hands of all enemies."[30] And in a very penetrating commentary on the Gospel of St. John he writes that she is deeply, mysteriously involved in the union of our souls with Christ.[31] "Mystically, the Mother of Jesus, the Blessed Virgin is in spiritual nuptials as councillor; for through her intercession one is joined to Christ by grace *(per ejus intercessionem conjungitur Christo per gratiam).*" And St. Thomas, after the example of the liturgy of the Church, applies to her the words, "In me is all hope of life and strength." Nor is this new doctrine in St. Thomas; we have already seen his teaching[32] that the union of divine and human natures is after the manner of a marital union, and that in this union Mary is our Mediatrix for she consents in the name of all human nature. Her part in the application to individual souls of the fruit of that contract is, fittingly, no less than her consent to the basic contract itself. *Omnia opera Dei perfecta sunt.*

Truly, St. Thomas teaches the reality involved in Mary's titles of Our Mother, Our Mediatrix, under Christ. For if through her we are truly joined unto Christ, is she not to us as a Mother communicating supernatural life itself and as a Mediatrix obtaining for us under Christ the graces we so need?

Our Lady's queenly rights and dignities were also taught by St. Thomas. So great is her dignity, her exaltation, that she is even above the blessed angels; this St. Thomas says both in the *Summa,*[33] in the Commentary on the Sentences[34] and again in his Commentary on the Ave Maria. Succinctly, aptly, he expressed the reality, *Quia Mater Domini, et ideo Domina.*

In one other of his works does St. Thomas treat of Our Lady as Queen. In that prayer to her which we have already mentioned, found among his *Piae Preces*, you will find Our Lady saluted by a host of gracious titles—as though St. Thomas' love sought to dwell upon each of the many aspects of Our Lady's glory, to savor each in its richness. Among those titles stands out the title of Queen. As Queen of Angels he salutes her, yes, and by a yet more tender title *Domina mea dulcissima*. The Queen of men and of angels was indeed Queen over this angelic man.

---

[29] *Serm. fest.*, n. 23.

[30] *Ibid.*, n. 32.

[31] Cf. *In evan. Joan.*, c. 2, l. 1, n. 2.

[32] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 30, a. 1.

[33] Cf. *loc. cit.*, a. 2.

[34] *In III lib. sent.*, d. 22, q. 3, a. 3, qa. 3, ad 3.

And what is the solid foundation upon which St. Thomas rests his teachings upon Our Lady's relationship to us? He rests it, as he seems to rest the remainder of his Marian doctrine, upon her relationship to God, upon that divinely given prerogative, the divine maternity. Thus in that sermon in which he exalts Our Lady as our refuge and temple of grace,[35] he clearly derives all that it says there, from the fact that she is the temple of God, inasmuch as in the Incarnation God himself came to dwell within her. His position again that she is our Mediatrix in the sanctification of our souls is rooted in the teaching that by her *fiat mihi* she consented in the name of all human nature to a union between our human natures and the divine; and surely that *fiat* was immediately concerned with her most holy maternity. And when St. Thomas points out Our Lady's role in the particular sanctification of each individual soul, the title by which he identifies her is not our Mother, nor Queen; but *Mater Dei*. From that font follows all else.

Now this apparently constant teaching of Thomas that all our Lady's privileges are rooted in her motherhood of God and derived from it—that in all Mariology the one fundamental principle is her motherhood of the divine Redeemer—this I venture to suggest is a most valuable contribution to Mariology, which contemporary Marian students would do well to re-examine. Many non-Thomistic Mariologists have rather dismissed it. Some Thomists, too, hesitate to accept it. But, I should like to suggest that Thomas' position is preferable. In the first place, it allies Mariology with Christology; an important point, since Mary's whole position must be understood in relation to Christ. Thus we know that Christ was divine and that He is our Redeemer. But it does not follow that there are two Christological principles, but only one; Christ is the divine Redeemer. To this is reduced, in Thomistic theology, all Christology and all Soteriology. Similarly in Mariology, Mary is the Mother of God; she is also associated with the Redeemer; a two-fold principle of Mariology need not follow but only the simple principle, Mary is the Mother of the divine Redeemer as such. That all Mariology be reduced to this seems evident from the fact that some theologians including, it seems, St. Thomas, do so reduce it. More convincing, perhaps, is this reason: the aim of theology is more and more to see things in something of the simplicity in which God sees them. As we know, one simple, divine decree ordained the whole redemptive Incarnation, down to its least detail. So the Fathers and St. Thomas say. Thus in the divine order, one decree would embrace all of Mary's place in our Redemption; and, in the human order Mary's one *fiat mihi* would correspondingly embrace all that God had decreed for her. By the one act, then, at once physical and moral, Mary would be Mother of the Redeemer as such, consenting to bring Him to us precisely as divine Redeemer. That one act, therefore, would embrace her own association with Him in our Redemption.

---

[35] *Serm. fest.*, n. 23.

Lastly, this Thomistic position has the tremendous advantage of rooting all of Mary's glorious dignity in God; it emphasizes that all her prerogatives are God-given. For if these prerogatives stem from that Maternity which was God's most lavish gift—the gift of Himself—then is her utter dependence on God in all things safeguarded. And so, while we must ever be in awe of her unutterable closeness to God, we shall be mindful always, as she was, that it was "He that is mighty that has done great things" to her. And in such fashion does Thomas himself conclude his Commentary on the Ave Maria. "Thus therefore," he writes, "is the Virgin Blessed: but more Blessed is the fruit of her womb."

URBAN MULLANEY, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

MISSION INTENTION

The Holy Father's Mission Intention for the month of September, 1950, is for the Indians of Latin America.

GENESIS I-XI AND PREHISTORY

PART II

With the fifth generation, we come across another far-reaching development, according to our text. Sella, one of Lamech's two wives, bears Tubal-Cain with whose name is connected the working of bronze (copper) and of iron (4:22). Copper will take us back some time around 5000 B.C. — in any case to a date far removed from the beginnings of mankind. Iron, on the available evidence, brings us down to a far more recent date. Terrestrial iron—as distinguished from meteoric iron used in Egypt in the 3d Millennium—appears in use about the 14th century B.C., and in Palestine, where it was for a time a Philistine monopoly, it became common later still (cf. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine* [1949], pp. 65, 110—an excellent "Pelican," book). Some commentators try to save this notice of metals, especially of iron, for the early period supposed by the context of Genesis, by minimizing its importance.[1] Others propose to drop the mention of the metals, at least that of iron which implies too definitely an impossibly recent date, about 1200 B.C. But this is a very poor solution of the difficulty, for the omission of iron would give us only a few thousand years and leave us very far still from the beginnings of mankind described by the text.[2] It may be added that, were we to drop the bronze (copper), this notice about Tubal-Cain would leave us nothing worth while. The other notice concerning Jabal (4:20), another son of Lamech, would seem to duplicate the earlier statement about Abel (4:2 f.). However, the Hebrew word here is wider than that in 4:2 (sheep: *ṣōn*) and it may include cattle: Jabal thus would represent nomadic shepherds, but not the real Bedouin type which is closely associated with the camel; we have no right to suppose that our present tradition implies camel breeding.[3] Lastly, another son of Lamech, Jubal (4:21) is credited with musical instruments: the *kinnōr,* a stringed instrument often mentioned in the Bible (cf. *I Sam.,* 16:23 etc.), a sort of lyre, and the *'ugāb* mentioned sometimes with the *kinnōr* (*Job* 21:12; 30:31), some kind of flute (cf. K. Galling, *Bibl. Reallex.* [Tüb. 1937], 389-94). Prehistoric archaeology knows as possible primitive instruments some kind of whistle from reindeer bone, used by hunters in the Palaeolithic Age (Aurignacian period) to remain in touch among themselves, and a fragment of the cubitus of a large bird with three artificial holes interpreted as a flute.[4]

---

[1] Cf. G. Hoberg, *Die Genesis* (2) 62, who explains those beginnings of the iron industry as "imperfect," even if the discovery was to have far-reaching consequences. For another explanation—questioning the views accepted by archaeologists—see G. Ch. Aalders, *Het Boek Genesis*, I (Kampen, 1933), 165 f. On metallurgy in the ancient Near East, cf. R. de Vaux, O.P., 1946, 121 f.; H. Obermaier, *Der Mensch aller Zeiten*, I, 493 ff., 545.

[2] There is no sufficient ground for questioning the mention of the metals in this vs., though the text may be in part difficult (cf. B. Jacob, p. 149). What may be doubtful is the compound name Tubal-Cain (for which the Greek has only Tobel) and the next words before the metals (cf. Goettsberger, *Bibl. Zts.*, XVII, 50). We may read: "and he was a forger of instruments of bronze [copper] and iron."

So far as we know, early man lived at first in the open air, and, with the coming of a colder climate, in natural caves which he did not trouble to clean: the hyena took care of that detail during the absence of the occupants in the summer time. Man lived by hunting. The evidence has survived in pictures and engravings—from the Magdalenian period—of scenes of hunting and of the means used in catching the animals on which man lived: different kinds of pits, traps and nets are represented,[5] also some enclosures in which animals not slaughtered at once could be kept for a time until they were needed; this possibly means a first step towards the domestication of animals. But the domestication of animals belongs to a much later date, possibly some time around 8000 B.C., when we find also evidence of man becoming a food producer in the sickle blades and picks of flint pointing to the agricultural stage of civilization.[6] The next development, settling in villages around permanent shrines—appears in the Near East which interests us especially on account of its closer connection with the Biblical tradition, in the Neolithic Age (cf. Albright, *op. cit.,* pp. 62 f.). We may say, in view of all the facts just mentioned, that the background of our narratives is the Neolithic Age or even the Bronze Age. That is to say, the whole immense Palaeolithic Age is passed over in silence, the tradition has preserved no real memory of that period of the first stages of human life: only the slow, patient labors of palaeontologists have revealed this to us.

---

[3] For the different types of nomads, see R. de Vaux, O.P., in *R. B.* (1949), 5 ff.

[4] Cf. G. Goury, *Origine et évolution de l'homme,* I (2) (*Époque paléolithique* [Paris, 1948]), 231 f.; cf. also 320, 359 f.; H. Obermaier, *op. cit.,* p. 225; Jos. Déchelette: *Manual d'archéologie,* I (*Arch. préhist.* [Paris, 1910]), 202 f.

[5] Cf. Goury, *op. cit.,* pp. 332 ff. According to Goury (p. 210) man at first was a vegetarian and became carnivorous later on (cf. *Gen.* 1:29; 9:1 ff.; and Dom Calmet on *Gen.* [French orig. ed., I, 14]; Hoberg, p. 22; Heinisch, pp. 101 f.; for a different view, cf. Rijckmans, *Het Boek Gen.* [Bruges, 1926], p. 16; J. Chaine, *Le livre de la G.* [Paris, 1948], pp. 29 f.).

Is it possible to fix the length of that primitive period and thus to come to any definite idea of the age of mankind? Many attempts have been made. In popular "scientific" treatments, we find writers piling up the millennia—time is not money here—to the bewilderment of the average reader. The actual fact is that we do not know. According to conscientious scientists who mean to be guided by real evidence, we have no certain scientific means of measuring the duration of the Palaeolithic Age. Scientists differ greatly and change their views, but generally the change is towards a longer duration. Thus, limiting ourselves to just a few cases as an illustration, we had Fr. Köppel, S.J., supposing a few years ago a minimum of 50,000 years; a minimum, as the evidence was judged too incomplete and new data might require more time; in his commentary on Genesis, Heinisch (p. 158) regarded 100,000 as too high, but in his recent work (*Probleme*), according to Van der Ploeg, O.P., he is ready to consider 200,000 plus as probable; the reviewer himself, Van der Ploeg, regards this as insufficient. We must simply acknowledge that we do not know, and for the present, we must content ourselves with knowing that the time required is incomparably longer than was thought at first by biblicists. We cannot state the length of time in any definite, final way with real assurance; we must be ready to accept whatever evidence may come to light even if it goes against what we were used to.[7] We may hold, with a prudent scientist referred to several times before, G. Goury (p. 497), that we stand on solid ground only in the Bronze Age, when the discoveries in the Near East enable us to reach sufficiently probable conclusions. Before the Bronze Age, there is no possibility of dating in a definite manner; it would be rash to pretend to enclose the great work of the origin and formation of man, the development of his civilization, within a definite number of years, or centuries, or millennia. All that can be said is that it took a tremendously long time, much longer than any duration suggested by any calculation based on the data found in the Biblical text.[8]

---

[6] The domestication of animals naturally was a slow process and would have taken place in different parts of the world independently. It need not be supposed that it originated only in one section from which it was then spread to the rest of the world by different waves of immigrants. Cf. Albright's *Archaeology of Palestine* (1949), pp. 59 f. For this period in general, cf. Goury, *op. cit.,* pp. 471 ff.; H. Obermaier, *op. cit.,* I, 444 ff. (for agriculture) and 454 ff. (for domestic animals); Jos. Déchelette, *op. cit.*, pp. 337 ff. For Syria-Palestine especially, R. de Vaux, O.P., *R. B.* (1946), 99-124, espec. 116 for the beginnings of agriculture and domestication of animals. Wild wheat has been found in S. Syria, Palestine and Transjordania. From this some authors argue that those regions were the cradle of the cultivation of wheat. The first animal to be domesticated was the dog, which was used in hunting before it was used in connection with herds.

---

[7] J. E. Steinmueller (*Some problems of O. T.* [1936]) would rather favor a low figure. He does not refer to Köppel's estimate of a minimum of 50,000 years, which by the way was reported, rather than proposed, by the latter. As a matter of fact, this minimum may be regarded as antiquated now. Fr. Breuil, himself a specialist of recognized authority, is quoted by Fr. Steinmueller for 20,000 years; but, as Fr. Lagrange remarks in his review of Steinmueller's book (*R. B.* [1937], 122), "Sans doute [Breuil] ne se ferait pas beaucoup prier pour ajouter un zéro."

[8] Cf. Jos. Déchelette, *op. cit.*, pp. 302 ff.; Obermaier, *op. cit.*, pp. 325-38; Goury, *op. cit.*, pp. 77 ff. Cf. Sir A. Keith, *New Discoveries Relating to the Antiquity of Man* (New York, n. d. [1930]), p. 34. He reduces his earlier time allowances by half. Whatever the truth may be, the fact is that we have no reliable chronometer; all we can say is that the Palaeolithic Age represents a tremendous stretch of time and that from the Neolithic to our own times is a relatively short period. With the self-restraint of the specialists, compare for instance the report in the *Washington Post* (Aug. 22, 1949, Part I, p. 2), which speaks of any time from 1,500,000 to 500,000 for the antiquity of man; evidently, time is *not* money! Cf. G. Grammow, *Biography of the Earth*, 1948 (in "Pelican Mentor Books"), pp. 117 ff.; man appears about 500,000 years ago. This author notes that according to his accompanying sketches, these men "were rather rough looking fellows and can be called men only because they resembled us more than they resembled the apes." Contrast Goury, *op. cit.*, pp. 97 ff. about the Neanderthal man, especially p. 200, n. 1: "Certains préhistoriens se sont amusés à tracer un portrait de l'Homme moustérien d'après son squelette. Ce sont là des fantaisies qui tournent facilement au ridicule. M. Boule a figuré dans ses *Hommes fossiles* (fig. 172) la réconstitution des muscles de la tête et du cou

Until a rather recent date, a Biblical chronology used to be built on the data of the genealogies in *Gen.* 5 and 11:10 ff.[9] Abstracting from unnecessary details, the conclusion from these texts may be presented roughly as follows. Between Adam and Abraham we get as the duration of I-XI 1946 years according to the Hebrew (MT), 2247 according to the Samaritan edition of the Hebrew, and 3312 according to the Greek (LXX). In round numbers, therefore, 2000 to 3000 years. If we add—again using round figures which are too high—some 2000 or 3000 years between Abraham and Christ, we get a total of 4000 or 5000 for the time from Adam to Christ, and with another round number of 2000 years from Christ to our present time, the result is 6000 or 7000 years from Adam to our time. To make generous allowance for omissions and similar causes of error, we might admit a total of 10,000 years altogether. It is hard to see how, if we wish to base ourselves on the data of the Biblical text, we might stretch the total beyond 10,000. But even with 10,000 years we are hopelessly below the minimum of time necessary to account for the known facts. Before the development of the modern sciences which have revealed to us something of the prehistory of mankind, there was no special reason for questioning the chronology calculated from the Biblical data. On the contrary, that chronology offered some advantages from the apologetic point of view, and we can understand not only why it was not doubted that a chronology could be established, but also why endangering that chronology could be resented. Bossuet and Dom Calmet could maintain, for instance, the possibility for Noe of acquaintance with sons or grandsons of Adam; Abraham could have known Sem; between Abraham and Moses then were only three links: Isaac, Jacob, and Levi. Thus it was possible to build up an argument for the faithful transmission of the tradition. But when Champollion's (d. 1832) Egyptological researches upset the received chronology, people were disturbed, objections were raised in the name of Scripture, and the great scholar had to be very careful not to scandalize his contemporaries. The evidence, how-

---

de l'homme de N., disposés sur le crâne. L'effet obtenu est loin de produire l'aspect simiesque que se sont plu à lui attribuer les soi-disant portraits dessinés."

[9] Some writers continue to defend what may be called the "traditional" Biblical chronology, though they may feel the necessity of rounding out the numbers (cf. *Denver Register* for April 11, 1948).

ever, gradually became too strong. Then Biblical scholars thought of another possible solution: there was no real chronology in Genesis. The numbers have not been preserved correctly, as appears from the differences in this point between the ancient witnesses of the text; moreover, we may suppose intentional omissions of names in the lists, so that we have no guarantee of the completeness of the lists. On this latter point, the case of Matthew 1 is regularly appealed to as a proof of deliberate omissions of links in a genealogy. For these two reasons, then, it is maintained quite commonly that there is no safe basis for establishing a Biblical chronology—a view which certainly would have surprised Bossuet and Dom Calmet and many others before the 19th century.

To this view of the chronology we may reply briefly that the uncertainty about the numbers in the lists is not as evident as is claimed. The differences between Hebrew (MT) and the other witnesses, especially LXX, may be explained from deliberate changes due to the desire of obtaining a longer chronology. Besides, whatever combinations of numbers may be made, no matter how generously we round out the numbers, the total remains hopelessly behind the required minimum—and thus cannot be due to uncertainty of the numbers. The appeal to Matthew 1 for the possibility of omissions in the genealogies of Genesis ignores the fact that the cases are not really parallel. Even on the most favorable view, all that could be maintained would be that in Genesis there *might be* omissions, but not that there *are* omissions. The fact is that St. Matthew tells us explicitly, we may say, that there *are* omissions, that his list is deliberately artificial: he means to have 14 names in each group, and he makes them to be 14 for a reason of his own. Genesis has nothing of the kind. The names are so clearly and so closely linked together that we have no right to slip in one or more extra links into the series. We may not reasonably interpret the statement that A begat B in such a year and lived so many years after that and died at such an age is equivalent to: A begat B through x number of descendants, making B in fact his grandson or great grandson, etc. This is reading into the text a meaning suggested by entirely alien considerations: namely, if the text is taken just as it stands, we run into a problem of chronology: therefore from a natural desire of obtaining some kind of agreement between the Biblical text and other evidence, one looks for some means of bringing about that agreement. This is "concordism" of the worst kind—an attitude which we have come to regard as wrong in connection with Chapter 1.

How then should we regard our text? We do not know the full positive answer. There is no disgrace in confessing our present ignorance of the real solution. But we have some elements which may contribute to the future explanation of the difficulty.

We have several similar lists of ante-diluvian Kings or Patriarchs in Babylonian cuneiform texts and one in Greek by the Babylonian priest Berosus (3rd cent. B.C.).[10] It is not the names themselves, which bear little or no resemblance to those of the Hebrew tradition, that interest us, but rather the numbers accompanying the names. What meaning did those numbers, which vary in the lists, have for the ancient readers? They are hardly intended as mathematical quantities corresponding to historical realities: it is difficult to imagine the Babylonians themselves taking them in the historical sense. Did they not see in them some other meaning? Could we surmise something of the kind in the Biblical lists, even if we are not now in a position to explain the significance? It is in this other value of the numbers that we could find some resemblance between our lists and Matthew 1. It is clear that the Evangelist attaches special significance to the number 14, and this fact remains even if we are not able to ascertain the significance it had for him: we know at least that he did not regard it as a purely historical reality.[11] If we take some such view of the numbers in Genesis, we avoid forcing upon them a meaning they did not have for the ancient tradition and we are not compelled to adopt an unnatural interpretation in order to bring about harmony between the Bible and Science.

---

[10] Cf. Chas. Jean, *Initiation* (2) 569 f.; *id*: *Milieu Biblique*, III, 186 f.; Plessis in *D. B.*, Suppl., art. "Babylone," 745-52.

[11] We may surmise that he regards 14 as the Hebrew letters D W D of David's name (4 + 6 + 4) and is thinking that 14 = 2 x 7. On the sacred numbers derived from 7, see B. Celada, "Numeros sagrados derivados del siete," *Sefarad* (1948), 48-77 and 333-356 (to be concluded). On the use of Seven in the Bible, cf. U. Cassuto, *From Adam* . . . and his bibliography on the subject in *Tarbiz* (Heb. rev.), XIII, 207 (notes 31 and 32). Some authors even find a pattern of sacred numbers (7 and multiples) in the text of our narratives, and hold that this may be taken as an indication of the Author's intention; cf. B. Jacob, *op. cit.*, pp. 156 f. and 310. There is a danger of exaggeration. Nevertheless it may be useful to remember that for the ancients numbers are not merely mathematical values, but symbols of ideas. Therefore, in places at least, they may have to be appreciated very differently from the manner in which we will treat them in a modern book.

The same view could be taken also of the data supposing extraordinarily long lives in the early Patriarchal Age. We have no historical evidence of any kind for such longevity. Here also palaeontology, so far is it goes, rather witnesses in favor of a short life for man in the Palaeolithic Age. According to Goury's analysis of the facts (p. 52), there was then "une mortalité infantile effroyable." The actual evidence in our possession is far from telling the whole tale, because the bones of young subjects can hardly be expected to be preserved. But what has been preserved—the remains of 187 persons of ascertainable age—shows a very large percentage dying before they were twenty. The average duration of life was apparently between twenty and forty years. Only three died after fifty. Yet it cannot be said that in the Lower Palaeolithic Age the conditions of life were exceptionally hard, at least from the point of view of climate. (cf. Goury, pp. 89 f.). It does not seem quite satisfactory to appeal with some authors to causes, natural and extraordinary, for the existence of which we have no real proof.[12] Here also, instead of setting up another kind of precarious concordism by appealing to more or less doubtful cases of exceptional longevity reported by writers, it might be safer to keep in mind the possibility of some other meaning of the numbers.

Another explanation has been proposed as a possibility. The Author is reproducing the document containing the genealogies without intending to guarantee all the details. His purpose is to show "the continuity of the true religion," and the document is used to concretize the idea.[13] On either of these two possibilities, it remains that the numbers should not be regarded as mathematical quantities to be used in chronological calculations, and thus there is no conflict between the Biblical tradition and other evidence.

---

[12] Cf. Simon-Prado, *Praelectiones biblicae, Vet. Test.* I (1934), p. 70: ". . . naturaliter ex pristino humanae naturae vigore, vitae sobrietate, salubri aëris temperie ciborumque virtute,—supernaturaliter ex speciali Dei providentia celeriori humani generis propagationi et primaevae revelationis conservationi consulentis." Practically the same considerations are urged by Steinmueller, *op. cit.*, p. 86. Cf. Strack, *Genesis* (2) 48; O. Zoeckler, *Die Lehre vom Urstand des Menschen* (Gütersloh, 1879), pp. 244-88 (Chap. 8, *Die Langlebigkeit der Patriarchen als Nachglanz der Paradiesesherrlichkeit*); Murillo, S.J., *El Génesis*, pp. 346 ff. For Jewish views, cf. B. Jacob, p. 169.

[13] Cf. S. Euringer, *Die Chronologie der Bibl. Urgesch.* (1909 [Bibl. Ztfr. 2, 11]), pp. 33 ff.; H. Junker, *Die Bibl. Urgesch.*, pp. 25 ff.; Heinisch

Richard Simon (d. 1721), the founder of Biblical Introduction in the modern sense of the word, and many others since, were struck by the literary peculiarities of the Flood narrative (6-8). They held that the account was composite, consisting of different strands of tradition put together without perfect harmonization. A glance at modern commentaries will show that this is still the common view. Heinisch, who has his own views about the sources of Genesis, here recognizes a combination of two different accounts, besides a number of minor glosses (pp. 173-77), though he maintains the agreement of the documents on all essential points (p. 176). The Jewish commentator B. Jacob rejects the critical view of the composite character of Genesis and devotes a large section of his work to a close discussion of the "Quellenscheidung" (pp. 949-1049), and examines the literary problem of the Flood-narrative (pp. 954-65). Cf. also, against the critics' "Documentary Hypothesis," U. Cassuto's work mentioned before: *La questione della Genesi,* and his Hebrew work: *The Documentary Hypothesis* (1941). The dissent of such authors, not due to theological bias, may serve as a reminder that there is still work to be done on the literary problems of the Pentateuch and it may help to prevent us from feeling too complacent about the "results" of the critical analysis.

Whether we explain the literary characteristics of the Flood narrative as done so commonly or adopt some other view, the historical difficulties remain the same, and it must be recognized that these difficulties are most serious. Since we cannot examine the problem here under all its aspects, we may limit ourselves to some of the items of the narrative. The authors who reject the idea of a Biblical chronology because of the supposed uncertainty of the numbers and of the supposed incompleteness of the lists, insist quite naturally that the date of the Flood cannot be fixed. The older writers, before the 19th century, who accepted the idea of

---

(*Probleme*) accord. to V. d. Ploeg (see above) regards the genealogies as tacit questions not guaranteed by the Author in all their details; therefore, not to be used in calculations.

a Biblical chronology, had no difficulty in dating the Flood. But even if that date could be pushed back to about 3000 B.C., it would remain manifestly impossible, because it would be irreconcilable with the sure data of science (history, archaeology, languages). If we disregard the Biblical chronology, we are free, of course, to put the date of the Flood much farther back; that is to say, we may suppose it to belong to a far distant past. However, even so, we should not imagine that we are free to push it as far back as we like into the unknown past, close to the beginnings of mankind. It should not be forgotten that the background of this early section of Genesis is not the earliest period known from palaeontology, the Palaeolithic Age, but a much more recent period. From this point of view, then, we would have to suppose a date within a time uncomfortably close to this historical period to allow for a satisfactory explanation of the details of the narrative. And the nearer to historical times we bring the Flood, the more difficult it becomes to account for the universality of the catastrophe. Practically all modern Catholic authors hold that in spite of the terms of the text it is not necessary to imagine the whole world submerged by the waters of the Flood: only the part inhabited by man at that time would have been involved.[14] This view would be acceptable if we had some good evidence that the disaster happened at a time when mankind occupied only a limited area. But even in the Lower Palaeolithic, man is found in many widely separated parts of the old world. At that time already, we are far from the beginnings of mankind. Man forms many different groups, there are several races: not one single group with the same civilization. The numerous finds in a large number of centers allow us to conclude that the human population was already considerable.[15] When then could we find a date for the Flood which would meet the conditions required for the anthropological universality? Certainly not within the background of this first part of Genesis.

---

[14] Hence the distinction of geographical and anthropological universality. The geographical universality was questioned on scientific grounds by Isaac Vossius (d. 1689) especially. For a discussion see Dom Calmet, I (1724), 70-76. See Hoberg, *Gen.*, pp. 79 ff. for the geographical limitation; on Hoberg, cf. Fr. (later Cardinal) McRory in the *Irish Theolog. Quart.* (July, 1903), 378 and A. Schulz in *Theol. Revue* (1908), 368 f. On the subject, cf. art. by A. Schulz in *Bibl. Zts.* (1910), 1-6; Murillo's excursus in his *El Gen.*, pp. 396 ff. Murillo thinks that Hoberg, Hetzenauer etc. "seem to forget the terms of the narrative." He does not indeed defend the geographical universality in exactly the same sense as Dom Calmet and others; but maintaining the absolute anthropological universality he must suppose that mankind had not yet spread too far. But since the waters rose above the mountains of Armenia (over 15,000 ft.) the surface covered by the Flood must have been "immense." The reader sees at once what scientific problems arise from such a view. It may be recalled here how A. Houtin could present the efforts and variations of apologists on the subject so as to cast ridicule on the Bible account itself.

In view of this chronological problem which cannot be sidestepped by declaring the date unknowable, if the anthropological universality is maintained, it is quite understandable that a number of modern Catholic scholars have come to envisage the possibility of a deluge limited to a part of mankind. Thus, A. Motais (1885), P. Schanz (in 1895), then Von Hummelauer, S.J., and others mentioned by Heinisch, and Heinisch himself both in his *Genesis* (pp. 183 f.) and in his recent work (*Probleme,* Chap. 5) according to Fr. Van der Ploeg; so also J. E. Steinmueller (1936), and J. Coppens (1937). On such a view of the Flood—as a local, regional disaster of huge proportions—it is clear that a distinction must be made between the event itself remembered by the Hebrew tradition which here is very close to the Mesopotamian tradition[16] and its literary presentation in a very free popular form. Evidently this is a matter which calls for further study, so that justice may be done to the different aspects of the problem.

Can we claim some kind of confirmation of the historical reality of the Flood as a regional catastrophe? Some authors think so.

---

[15] Cf. Goury, *op. cit.*, pp. 73, 93, 129 f.; H. Obermaier, *op. cit.*, pp. 113-222 (an already old presentation of the facts which, however, proved the wide diffusion of man in the Palaeolithic Age); L. Capitan-Faguet, *Le préhistoire* (1931), pp. 27-116.

[16] A. Motais, *Le déluge biblique* (Paris, 1885); P. Schanz in *Tüb. Quart. S.* (1895), 4 ff.; Hummelauer, *Gen.*, pp. 223 ff.; Steinmueller, *op. cit.*, pp. 119, and cf. 100. It is not necessary to mention other names for a view now rather commonly accepted. For the non-biblical texts and studies of their relations to the Bible, cf. Dhorme, *Textes*, pp. 100-129; H. Winckler, *Keilinschriftl. Textb.z. A. T.* (3) (1909), pp. 80-90; G. Contenau, *L'épopée de Gilgamesch* (Paris, 1939); cf. *R. B.* (1940), 302 f. However the account of the Flood is omitted in Tablet XI because Contenau, for literary reasons, regards it as an interpolation. But it is given in his other work: *Le déluge babyl.*; *Ishtar aux Enfers*; *La tour de Babel* (Paris, 1941); A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and O. T. Parallels* (2) (Chicago, 1949), pp. 80 ff., 224 ff. Chas. Jean, *Milieu bibl.*, 2, 239 ff., 3, 370 ff.; J. Plessis, *D. B.* Suppl., art. "Babylone" (1928), 754-764.

However, if we wish to avoid concordistic pitfalls, we must be prudent and not accept "evidence" too readily. It is hardly necessary to recall that the "Diluvium" of the geologists is something quite different from the Biblical Deluge, and it is wise to refrain from tying up our account with any scientific hypothesis (on the Diluvium, cf. v. gr. De Morgan, *La préhistoire orientale,* I [Paris, 1925], pp. 57 ff.). More recently, excavations in Southern Mesopotamia by the English archaeologists Woolley, Mackay and Langdon revealed thick layers of soil above and below which were to be found signs of human occupation. This has been explained by some scholars as the result of a huge inundation which would account for the tradition of the Flood.[17] But this interpretation of the evidence has been questioned by other scholars. Some claim that the inundation at Kish and that at Ur represent floods which took place at different dates. Others again explain the fact very differently, viz. from the action of the desert wind.[18] We should not use this new evidence too hastily. Even on the view that we have here an immense inundation, it could not be said that we have direct confirmation of the tradition; the facts would not, even then, coincide completely with the data of the Biblical account.

EDWARD P. ARBEZ

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

---

[17] Cf. A. Parrot, *De Babylone à Jéricho* (2) (Paris, 1933), p. 9. The Babyl. accounts relate *grosso modo* the same cataclysm as the one described in Genesis. "Cataclysme dont les traces ont été, semble-t-il, repérées par les fouilles—cataclysme essentiellement régional et mésopotamien." Cf. *id.*, *Archéologie mésopotamienne,* I (Paris, 1946), 296, 319. G. Contenau, *Manuel d'archéol. orientale,* IV (Paris, 1947), 1795 and ref.

[18] On the excavations at Ur and Kish, cf. *R. B.* (1934), 602-10 and (1938), 152 f. This latter text touches on the evidence for the "Flood."

THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN STATE TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ACCORDING TO THE *PONTIFICALE ROMANUM*

In our own time, when questions have arisen about the necessity of the profession of the Catholic faith on the part of a state or civil society composed of Catholics, it is highly interesting and enlightening to turn to one of the Church's official liturgical books for information on this subject. The *Pontificale Romanum,* in its section *De benedictione et coronatione regis,* contains pertinent and important teaching on this matter. It shows, in the last analysis, that the Church expects the Catholic sovereign of a Catholic nation to profess and to protect the Catholic faith in his capacity as the head of the state.

The ceremony for the benediction and the coronation of a king is one of the sacramentals of the Church. Thus, although it does not confer sanctifying grace *ex opere operato,* nevertheless, by reason of the Church's prayers it is definitely an apt means for the obtaining of that gift and of the graces necessary for his state in life by the one who receives it. Furthermore, the instructions and the prayers incorporated into this ceremony offer us an unrivalled insight into the Church's high and accurate concept of civil authority, its prerogatives and its duties.

In the *Pontificale Romanum* the section on the benediction and the consecration of kings comes immediately after that which deals with the benediction and the consecration of nuns. The Church, properly enough, chooses to deal first with those whose lives are consecrated immediately and directly to spiritual ends. The ceremonies for rulers and for soldiers come at the end of the first part of the *Pontificale,* the one concerned with the benediction or consecration of persons.

The rite for the benediction and the coronation of a king begins in much the same way as do the ceremonies of Holy Orders. A prelate, in this case the first in rank among the bishops of the territory, addresses the Metropolitan with the announcement that Holy Mother Church asks that he (the Metropolitan) raise this noble soldier to the royal dignity. The Metropolitan then inquires if those who seek this elevation know that the king-elect is worthy and useful for this dignity. The Bishop's reply is "Et novimus, et credimus eum esse dignum, et utilem Ecclesiae Dei; et ad regimen hujus regni."

The Catholic Church is God's kingdom on earth. It is the one society within which men are to find the fellowship of Christ. It is the one assembly ordered to and requisite for the attainment of that supernatural eternal life which Our Lord died to procure for the children of men. Thus it would be false to its own divine commission if it were to overlook the attitude and the influence of a temporal ruler of a Catholic state. A man would not be beneficial to the people of that state were he to be other than "useful" to the Church of God. The welfare (even the temporal well-being) of the people of that state is *de facto* inseparable from the welfare of the Church within it.

As in the administration of the sacrament of Holy Orders, the preliminary interrogations are followed in this ceremony of the coronation of a king by an instruction given to the candidate by the presiding prelate. In the course of this instruction the Metropolitan assures the prince that all the power by which kings rule and legislators judge righteously is from the Lord God, and that he himself must one day render an account to God of the people committed to his care. The prince is told that it is his duty to live a morally good life, to worship the Lord his God with his whole mind and with a pure heart, to retain the Christian faith and the Catholic religion inviolate to the end, and to defend it with all his strength against all of those opposed to it.

The instruction goes on to say that it is the king's business "to show reverence to the prelates of the Church and to the other priests," and in no way to infringe upon the liberty of the Church. Then it declares that the ruler is obliged in conscience to defend widows and orphans, and all the poor and the weak from oppression, and that he is bound to be kind, gentle, and affable to all of those who approach him. He is told that he must rule, not for his own profit, but for the good of the entire populace, and that he is to expect his reward, not in this world, but in the next.

Immediately after this instruction is finished, the ceremony calls for the candidate to profess "before God and His angels" that, to the best of his capacity and knowledge, he will keep and observe law, justice, and peace for the Church of God and the people subject to him. He promises that he will show proper and legitimate honor to the prelates of God's Churches and that he will respect all that has been granted and conceded by other rulers to the Churches. He furthermore pledges himself to respect the abbots, the nobles, and the populace of his kingdom.

In the prayer which follows after the candidate's profession, the Metropolitan and the other Bishops present beg God that the new king "may happily win the triumph of desirable victory over the enemies of the cross of Christ and that he may put the terror of his power upon them." In the prayer at the anointing of the king's right arm, the Metropolitan prays that the newly anointed may be "strong, just, faithful, provident, an untiring ruler of this kingdom and of the Lord's people, and a defender of the Lord's holy Church and of the Christian faith."

When the royal sword is conferred upon the newly anointed, the Metropolitan begs God to make this ruler one who will fight for and defend the Church of God and its members, and one who will oppose the enemies of the Christian name. And, in the actual ceremony of coronation, the Pontiff prays that "as we are known to be the pastors and the rulers of souls *in interioribus,* you (the newly crowned ruler) may be *in exterioribus* a true worshipper of God and a vigorous defender of God's Church against all who attack it." When the king is led to his throne he is reminded that his position in the cathedral, between the place of the clerics and that assigned to the people, means that Our Lord, the mediator of God and of men, has made him a mediator of the clergy and the people.

In one of the prayers of the Mass, the celebrant asks God that the people subject to the newly crowned monarch may keep to the truth. In the postcommunion prayer of this Mass, the Church begs God that the new ruler may be protected against all evils, so that he may enjoy the tranquillity of ecclesiastical peace and, in the next life, obtain his eternal reward.

The important thing about this ceremony is that the king is represented as an actual ruler, rather than as a mere figurehead. He is actually charged with the duty of governing his people. And, it is precisely in his capacity as a ruler, exercising all the various functions which constitute sovereign jurisdiction, that the Church expects him to profess the Catholic faith and the Catholic religion, to defend the Church, and to assist in preserving good relations between the clergy and the people.

It is to be noted that the king is considered precisely as a ruler of a Catholic community. In the preliminary instruction, the Metropolitan informs the new ruler that he is to assume *"regendi* fideles *populos tibi commissos curam."* It is obvious that a government could not be expected to function in the manner envisaged in the ceremony if the civil society over which it presided were other than one composed of members of the true Church of God.

The essential point is, however, that under the circumstances to which the ceremony of the *Pontificale Romanum* looks, when the people and the rulers are members of the Catholic Church, the Church considers it the duty and the privilege of the government to act precisely as the government of a Catholic state, to protect and to foster the true faith, and to be of assistance in the work of the Church itself. The official prayer of the Church certainly gives no indication that a state composed of Catholics would be doing its duty merely in giving the Church the same liberties it would accord to some spurious religion.

Furthermore, we must realize that the *Pontificale Romanum*, in describing this sacramental, has in mind what authors dealing with the question of Church and state call the *thesis* rather than the *hypothesis*. This, in the absolute sense, is what a state should be with reference to the Church itself. Obviously the Church does not mean to imply that hereditary monarchy, or, for that matter, any other form of monarchy, is inseparable from the concept of a truly Catholic state. It does, however, imply that a vigorous defence and support of the Church on the part of the government (whatever form that government may take) is involved in the idea of a good civil society among Catholics.

Certainly there can be no doubt that, in any case, all men are meant by God to profess the Catholic faith and to live within the fellowship of the Catholic Church. To deny this paramount fact would be to deny the universal applicability of the merits of Jesus Christ Our Lord, or to question the universality of God's salvific will. The fact that some men are not favored with membership in the Church is objectively an evil. The responsibility for making this membership available to all men rests squarely upon the Catholics themselves.

Since, then, Our Lord's invitation to fellowship with Himself within the Catholic Church is extended to all men, and since the ceremony described in the *Pontificale Romanum* looks to a situation in which the citizenry of a given state is completely Catholic, we may say that this ceremony and the teachings implied in it have to do with the *thesis* itself. Apart from special considerations which spring from ignorance of the true faith or a lack of missionary spirit on the part of Catholics within a given realm, the good ruler of a properly organized state is looked upon as one who governs justly, who seeks the benefit of the citizens rather than his own profit from his conduct of the state, and, in the final analysis, one who is realistic enough to foster and defend the true faith and the true Church against the forces which would seek to hinder or to destroy them.

It is interesting to note that the teaching of the *Pontificale Romanum* on the relation of the Christian state to the Catholic Church is exactly the same as that contained in the great papal encyclicals which have dealt with this problem. Thus it must manifestly be counted among those truths to which the Holy Father refers in his magnificent encyclical *Humani generis*, when he declares that "generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine." It is a teaching clearly and conclusively presented by the Church in its ordinary and universal *magisterium*. Consequently, despite the fact that the Church has issued no solemn definition on this point, Catholic writers and teachers can definitely not consider themselves free to state explicitly or even to suggest that a civil society composed of members of the true Church can act as God wills that it should by withholding an explicit and specific profession of the Catholic faith and by refusing an explicit and specific recognition of the Catholic Church. The truth that the state, like every other human society, is objectively obligated to worship God according to the one religion He has established and commanded is so obiviously a part of Catholic doctrine that no theologian has any excuse to call it into question.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

THE SUPPLEMENTARY CONFESSOR OF RELIGIOUS WOMEN

Question: In speaking of the supplementary confessors of religious women the Code states that they are appointed by the Ordinary so that the nuns can easily go to them in particular cases without the need of approaching the Ordinary each time. (Can. 521, § 2). Now, does this mean that the initial step in going to confession to these priests must come from the nuns themselves? For example, would it be permissible for the regular confessor, if he is unable to fulfill his weekly appointment for confession at a convent, to ask one of these supplementary confessors to take his place?

Answer: Undoubtedly, the Code supposes that the nun herself requests the services of a supplementary confessor rather than that he comes to hear her confession on his own initiative or at the request of the ordinary confessor. Indeed, there is some doubt whether the "particular case" mentioned in the Code has reference to individual religious only or to the whole community; but Schaefer asserts that by a broad interpretation of the Canon an entire community can ask for the services of a supplementary confessor in the event of the absence or sickness of the ordinary confessor (Schaefer, *De Religiosis* [Rome, 1940], 374). He suggests this as the best method when the ordinary confessor is absent, although he adds that sometimes the matter is arranged by the Ordinary in such wise that when the regular confessor is impeded, the extraordinary confessor shall take his place. (*Ibid.*, 372).

When the supplementary confessor comes for confessions on his own initiative or at the request of the regular confessor, without any expression of a request on the part of the nuns, his action would seem to be venially illicit, but there would be no difficulty about the validity of the confessions. In the words of Cappello: "If the ordinary confessor, without the knowledge of the Bishop, should go away for a week or two, and should substitute one of the supplementary confessors in his place, the confessions would be valid, because this latter's jurisdiction is not limited, but *per se* they would be venially illicit, since this procedure would not be in harmony with ecclesiastical discipline" (Cappello, *De Sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], II, n. 469).

THE FORM OF MARRIAGE

Question: In the form of marriage usually employed in the United States would it not be better to say "in sickness as in health" instead of "in sickness and in health"?

Answer: There seems to be no special reason for introducing such a modification. The promise means that the parties will be faithful to each other in all the contingencies of life, and this seems to be sufficiently expressed by the form now in use. It is well to remark that the words in question apparently date from pre-Reformation times, for they were incorporated into the prayer-books approved by Edward VI in the middle of the sixteenth century. In the form of marriage prescribed in the official Latin Ritual there are no phrases corresponding to these promises, the entire form consisting of the words of the priest asking the consent of the parties and their reply expressing consent.

MORAL PROBLEMS IN SURGERY

Question 1: Is it lawful to perform a sterilizing operation (irradiation of the ovaries) on a pregnant woman for the purpose of relieving a cancerous condition of the breast, if it is very probable that the fetus will be aborted?

Question 2: A woman has had two children through a Caesarean operation, and is now carrying a third which will very probably be brought into the world in the same manner. The doctors claim that after this third operation the uterus will be so scarred that it is likely to rupture subsequently. May it be removed on the occasion of the next delivery on the ground that it is in a pathological condition?

Answer 1: If reliable doctors testify that there is good probability that the operation will subtantially relieve the cancerous condition and that it cannot be deferred until the child is viable, the operation would seem to be lawful, especially if there is a good chance that even after it has taken place the child will survive and be brought into the world alive.

Answer 2: If the uterus will be a serious menace to the woman's life or health because of the scars—that is, if it is liable to rupture even though she does not become pregnant again—it may be removed on the occasion of the next Caesarean operation as an organ subject to a pathological condition. But if the danger of rupture will be brought on only by a future pregnancy, it may not be excised. For in this latter supposition, it is the pregnancy, not the scars that will cause trouble; hence, a hysterectomy in these circumstances would be eugenic sterilization, a bad means to a good end. If a couple in this situation fear dangerous complications from a future pregnancy, they may avert the risk by the only lawful measure available, abstinence from marital relations, either total or partial.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

SOLEMN MASS OR SOLEMN HIGH MASS

Question: How is the Latin term, *missa solemnis,* to be translated into English? Should one say, Solemn Mass or Solemn High Mass? We often hear the latter designation. Is there justification for it?

Answer: We have always thought the term, Solemn High Mass, an example of tautology. If Mass is solemn, *a fortiori* it is also high. However, we often meet with the double adjective to describe a Mass sung with the assistance of deacon and subdeacon. Indeed, it is quite frequently used in church announcements to designate the chief Mass in celebration of a feast.

Although common in popular usage, we do not know of any standard author who employs this redundant expression. Our *Baltimore Ceremonial* calls a Mass with sacred ministers simply a High Mass. What is termed in Latin *Missa Cantata* this United States authority designates as a "Mass without deacon and subdeacon." Fortescue's *The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described* also calls a Mass with sacred ministers a High Mass. It is true that Wuest-Mullaney (*Matters Liturgical*) speaks of a Solemn High Mass which he distinguishes from High Mass, the *Missa Cantata,* which holds the middle place between the Solemn Mass and the Low Mass. Yet, even he frequently uses the simpler term Solemn Mass without the supplementary adjective, High. (Cf. the text *passim* under the heading, "Solemn High Mass.")

For our own poor part, we prefer Solemn Mass to mean Mass sung with the attendance of deacon and subdeacon and High Mass to mean one *in cantu* but without sacred ministers. With the double-barreled designation, solemn high, we have no commerce.

THE HYMN OF EXPOSITION IN THE VERNACULAR

Question: Must not the hymn which is sung at the moment of exposition of the Blessed Sacrament be in Latin, just as the *Tantum ergo* must be? I know that between the actual exposition and the *Tantum ergo* hymns may be sung either in Latin or in the vernacular but is it not required that the hymn which is sung *in ipso actu expositionis* be only in Latin?

Answer: The only hymn which is really of obligation at Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is the *Tantum ergo* and this must be in Latin. No hymn is required at the moment of exposition. Should one be sung, however, there is no legislation which prescribes that it be sung in Latin. If, as is quite usual, the hymn of exposition should be the *O Salutaris*, this must be in Latin as there are a number of decisions of the Sacred Congregation that all hymns which are liturgical texts must be sung in Latin when chanted *coran Sanctissimo.* (Cf. S. R. C. 3124, 7; 3537, 3; 4235, 8; 4268, 10.) The *O Salutaris* is liturgical, being made up of the final verses of the hymn for Lauds of Corpus Christi. Should a non-liturgical text be selected as the hymn of exposition, we know of no legislation requiring it to be sung in Latin.

THE MATERIAL OF THE TABERNACLE VEIL

Reprise

Question: May, or may not, a veil of transparent silk be used as the *conopaeum* of the tabernacle? There seems to be no definite legislation on the matter. *Velare* means to cover, or hide, so one might think that the veil should not be transparent. On the other hand, the tabernacle veil indicates the presence of the Blessed Sacrament on the altar, so I suppose that a transparent veil might serve just as well as the heaviest cloth. Then, quite frequently, many priests do not care to hide a "nice" gold tabernacle by concealing it in a veil of opaque material.

Answer: The rubric of the Ritual (Tit. IV, Cap. 1, 6), which prescribes the use of the *conopaeum* around the tabernacle, says nothing about the material of which it is to be made. It simply requires that the tabernacle be *conopaeo decenter opertum.* The tabernacle may be covered, to meet the prescription of the rubric, without being hidden. Therefore, it would seem that the law is fulfilled by using a veil of gold lace or other transparent material as well as by enveloping the tabernacle in one of opaque fabric. Our own preference is for the *conopaeum* of material neither transparent nor translucent but *Ubi lex non distinguit nec nos distinguere debemus.*

WHEN THE NAME OF THE ORDINARY IS NOT A SAINT'S NAME

Question: When the name of the Ordinary is not that of a saint, it seems peculiar to insert it in the *Preces feriales* of the Office and still more incongruous to pronounce it in the Canon of the Mass. Evidently, it should not be omitted entirely but what should one do?

Answer: The rubrics say simply that the name of the Ordinary is to be mentioned at the letter *N.* of the concluding portion of the opening prayer of the Canon. A similar direction is given for the *Preces feriales* of the Office at Lauds and Vespers. No distinction is indicated for the case where the name in question does not happen to be that of a saint of the Martyrology. Hence, we conclude that the name of the bishop, as it is commonly known, should be inserted both in the Mass and the Office. However, it is quite usual when a family name is given as the first name of a baptized individual, there is prefixed a saint's name, though this latter is not customarily used in designating the bearer. While we see no obligation to do so, this saintly *praenomen* may be pronounced along with the profane (?) name when the bishop is mentioned in a liturgical text.

MINISTER OF EXPOSITION AND THE MINISTERING DEACON

Question: When the master of ceremonies (priest or deacon) has exposed the Blessed Sacrament for Solemn Benediction, should he or the deacon in dalmatic hand the ostensorium to the celebrant just before the actual blessing?

Answer: When a minister of exposition is used at Solemn Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, he is to act merely as minister of exposition and reposition and not to perform the rest of the role of the ministering deacon in sacred vestments. Hence, if the ostensorium is to be handed to the officiant (who, by the way, may take it directly from the altar table), it is the ministering deacon who is to perform this service.

William J. Lallou

The Doctrinal Value of the Encyclicals

Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical letters does not in itself demand consent, on the pretext that in writing such letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: "He who heareth you, heareth me"; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine. But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that the matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in the encyclical *Humani generis.*

Book Reviews

THE APOSTOLIC PARISH. By James J. Navagh. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1950. Pp. xiii, 166. $2.50.

With the Ascension of Our Lord and the Coming of the Holy Spirit the establishment of the Church and the essential assignment of its members to their roles and ministries was completed. The last word on the mutual relationship of clergy and people had been spoken with divine eloquence far beyond the possibility of human addition or amendment.

But one particular circumstance of the Pentecostal visitation should never be forgotten. On that great day when the words of the "Word" were first echoed by the Apostles we read that each member of the Christian audience heard in *his own tongue* the wondrous works of God. Thus from its very beginning we observe in the Church both an unchanging, unchangeable synthesis of truths and a never-wearying effort to accommodate the propagation of their Message to the divers idioms and manners of men.

Humanity, indeed, never changes; human beings change with each new thought. Thus we shall always welcome books like *The Apostolic Parish* which teach us the newest strategies, the latest practical wisdom of those who do the work of God this year, this day, this hour.

Father Navagh, Director of the already renowned Missionary Apostolate of the Diocese of Buffalo, is prompted by the generosity of his zeal to give his fellow-priests, as best the printed page can, the benefit of his experience and conclusions. That he does so with the blessing and encouragement of the truly apostolic Bishop O'Hara, who contributes the Foreword, will add to the enthusiasm with which zealous priest-readers will take up the book.

Not too long ago Robert Kothan said quite baldly: "In the face of today's needs, it is certain that many forms of the apostolate . . . *no longer meet the situation*. We are now witnessing a complete overturning of ideas and customs, and the Church if she is to adapt herself to the apostolic requirements of the immediate future, will have, to some extent, to modify the structure of her organization. She must find new methods of action, and *think out her pastoral message afresh."* (Translated from the French by Frank Maher. Sheed & Ward, New York, 1948. *The Priest and the Proletariat.*)

Again, Cardinal Suhard, late Archbishop of Paris, in the arresting and sober message issued, appropriately, on Holy Thursday, 1949, anniversary alike of the institution of both Eucharist and Priesthood, also believed that the Church must "think out her pastoral message afresh." "To be a priest suited to the Twentieth Century," he says, "is not a matter of slavishly copying methods suited to former times, nor . . ." —and it is extremely important to reflect on what follows—"nor of inventing new forms for the sake of novelty, but it means *to translate the message of Christianity into present-day terms.*" (*Integrity* reprint, New York.)

The basic principle underlying these contentions is far from novel; it is perfectly understood by every fervently orthodox lay or clerical proponent of the Faith: in the preaching of His Gospel Christ wishes *non nova sed nove.*

And so, no thoughtful minister of God need be reminded of the truth expressed by these two authors,—two out of many who have written currently on this theme. Sometimes, however, perhaps from the natural bewilderment of men facing responsibilities not entrusted to angels, there is not so readily apparent that perfect wedding of zeal and practicality, of timely inspiration and permanent policy which is so required in the fruitful apostolate. The work of the Church is, by divine promise, indefectible; *de facto,* however, it is not necessarily completely successful in every circumstance and at any given time. Our presentation of the indefectible may have its deficiencies; our share in the infinite can be very finite indeed,—perhaps even fatuous in some cases. In the course of our extraordinary ministry the weakness of the flesh is no less authentic a symptom than is the willingness of the spirit.

To counsel us, to guide us, and by clarifying issues to encourage us, is the purpose of Father Návagh's book. One of the helpful clarifications is the emphasis with which the Reverend author, for practical purposes, breaks down the overwhelming concept of the Church into the easier morsel which is "the parish." "The actual parish," he reminds us, "consists in the souls, good, bad, indifferent, who are assigned to the parish or who live within its borders." Here, then, "within the parish borders," is the *locale,* clearly and well defined, of an individual priest's work; *all* souls living therein, souls identifiable by name and address, are the parish. In *this* place, and with *these* people, we are called to work. Our work is to bring the tidings of Redemption and the fruits thereof to them, to them first, last and always, and to *all* of them.

Having reiterated this fact, as a retreat master would, the author now begins to prove, and prove very convincingly, that he is not speaking academically and *a priori.* It is hard to resist the temptation to quote him lavishly. It is not being prodigal of compliments to say that there are few volumes on pastoral theology which can promise more immediate improvement of the apostolic spirit of one's priesthood than this one. Hard and unglamorous matters like the value of good example are not glossed over for the sake of not disquieting the oversensitive "Fathers." The author also believes in work, physical and mental both. "Since you have a vocation to the apostolate, it is wrong to spend all your time in prayer. The sacristy priest is a burden to the Church."

Almost every chapter in the book, there are twenty-two of them, deserves special comment. We particularly like the one on Catholic Action. It is unthinkable, after all the pronouncements of the Sovereign Pontiffs, that this great "movement," for want of a better word, which may distinguish the history of the Church in our times, is unknown or a matter of indifference or supererogation to the clergy.

At times, however, one would suspect that some priests are less hopeful than the Popes in regard to the participation of the laity in the ministry of "The Apostolic Parish." Father Navagh, as usual, speaks out. "In too many parishes," he justly complains, "the effort asked of the laity consists in giving money to support the Church, raising money to support the Church, and passively assisting at Mass and receiving the Sacraments. They are tired of it and they want to do more. Where they have had an opportunity, they have done tremendously more. If you run through this book, you will see how much of the work now done by priests could be well done just by the laity. We should aim for the day when the priest will be completely occupied with his spiritual duties and the laity, filled with the same great love of God as is the priest, and devoted to the Church as the priest is, will relieve their priest of all except his priestly functions."

Quod faxit Deus!

✠ John Wright
Bishop of Worcester

The Great Mantle. By Katherine Burton. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1950. Pp. xiv+226. $3.00.

Holy Year visitors to the Eternal City never fail to observe the kneeling groups of men, women, and children from all walks of life around the tomb of Pope Pius X. It is by far the most popular of all the many shrines in the great basilica save only the place sacred to the remains of the Prince of Apostles himself. It has been thus since 1914 when the great heart of Pius X stopped beating, and the common people of Rome exclaimed, "A saint is dead!"

No time was lost on the part of the faithful followers of Pius X in starting the long process that might lead to the honors of the altar for this gentle pastor of souls. His cause, while still far from canonization, moved one step closer to the goal on April 29, 1950. On that day the Sacred Congregation of Rites met in an ante-preparatory session in Rome to discuss whether he practiced virtue to an heroic degree. The result of this important preliminary session was highly encouraging.

The Great Mantle, a biography of Pope Pius X by Katherine Burton, noted Catholic writer, will receive an enthusiastic reception from those who have known and loved Pius X for long, but it will make myriads of new friends for him too. This life of the saintly Pontiff is timely. Despite the newly awakened interest in Pius X through the efforts of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine (which he revived in our time), the few popular biographies of Pius X have been scarce or out of print. The *Symposium on the Life and Work of Pope Pius X,* which was published by the Confraternity in 1946, is the work of specialists in the many fields touched on by the Pontiff. It does not aim "at the general." Mrs. Burton writes with singular grace of style and with a charm and warmth that bring the reader to full sympathy and devotion for "the parish priest of Tombola who became the parish priest of the world."

We are introduced to the Sarto family in Riese, a tiny village in northern Italy, where Joseph, second eldest of six children (the first-born died in infancy). was born on June 2, 1835. The family of the future Pope was very poor in worldly goods but rich indeed in charity and piety. Here truly was that *ecclesia domestica* which St. Chrysostom aptly calls the Catholic home. Joseph Sarto was an eager and conscientious student from the early years when he walked the four miles to school in Castelfranco with his shoes slung on his shoulder and a piece of bread in his pocket. He won a scholarship to the seminary in Padua and after having made a brilliant record, was ordained on Sept. 18, 1858.

In reading the account of the priestly labors of the future Pope Pius X from a humble curacy in Tombola to the pastorate at Salzano, then as diocesan official and seminary professor, one is ever aware of the directing finger of Providence. The great qualities of soul and mind we have come to see in Pius X are already present in the humble, hard-working, intensely capable, and deeply charitable young priest and prelate. When the episcopal see of Mantua fell vacant in 1884, Monsignor Sarto was appointed to this difficult post by Leo XIII. At once he set to work repairing the ravages wrought in his flock by neglect due largely to political disturbances; and in a few years the condition of the diocese of Mantua was a model of spiritual activity and of administrative efficiency. The charity of Bishop Sarto kept him poor, and the ceaseless round of catechizing, preaching, administration of the Sacraments, and work for social and industrial improvement brought amazing benefits to his people.

Small wonder is it that in the summer of 1893, Leo XIII conferred on Bishop Sarto the cardinal's hat and appointed him Patriarch of Venice. There followed ten more years of what was a veritable proximate preparation for the great work he was to accomplish as Supreme Pontiff. His interests in this large diocese were as varied and no less extensive than those which occupied him as Pius X. We see the same intense love for the poor, his work to improve catechetical instruction and to revive the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, to encourage frequent reception of the Sacraments, to form a deeply spiritual and well-trained clergy, and to restrict and pacify the conflicting political elements which threatened the work of the Church during the last decade of the century. All of these pressing problems, on a world scale, were to be met with by him with the same unfailing strength and refined prudence when he ascended the Chair of Peter.

It came as a crushing blow to this simple, humble pastor of souls when, after almost forty-five years of faithful work in the Lord's vineyard, at the age of 68, he was elected to succeed Leo XIII on Aug. 4, 1903. What follows is part of the history of the Church. The first message of the new Pope sounded the motif of his entire Pontificate: "To restore all things in Christ." It may be affirmed that he is exceeded by no other Pope in the wide range of his interests and in the vast sweep of his accomplishments. He is the Pope of the catechism, of the Holy Eucharist, of Catholic Action, of the reform of church music, of the codification of canon law, of the condemnation of Modernism; the Pope of the missions, and of the poor and lowly everywhere. And above all these qualities there shines out the simple holiness of his life rich in virtues.

We have but briefly compassed the story of Pope Pius X as it is revealed in *The Great Mantle.* The title is aptly taken from Dante: "How heavy is the great mantle to him who guards it from the mire." This is an inspiring book. We wish that more primary sources had been used throughout and that the inner spiritual life of the saintly Pontiff had received greater prominence. This perhaps will come when there is access to the documents of the various processes. But this omission does not detract from the excellent and living portrait of Pius X which Mrs. Burton has given us. May this biography do its part to hasten that hoped for day when the Church will see fit to elevate this Servant of God to the glory of the altars.

Joseph B. Collins, S.S.

VESTMENTS AND VESTURES. A Manual of Liturgical Art. By Dom E. A. Roulin, O.S.B. Translated by Dom Justin McCann, O.S.B. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1950. Pp. xv+308. $4.00.

Liturgical bibliography concerning ecclesiastical vestments is surprisingly limited in extent. There is the classic *Die liturgische Gewandung* of Joseph Braun, S.J., on vestments properly so called, and the equally classic, though somewhat quaint, *Le Costume et les Usages Ecclésiastiques* of Barbier de Montault, for ecclesiastical costume. Nainfa's *Costume of Prelates* is now out-of-date as well as out-of-print, though quite adequately supplanted by Fr. McCloud's *Clerical Dress and Insignia.* The volume before us therefore appears with considerable *à propos.*

Vestments and Vesture makes no claim to be a scientific or learned treatise on the subject of which it treats but aims to be a practical guide in the manufacture and use of liturgical vestments. Not only garments worn in ecclesiastical functions but the linen of liturgical accessories and the material out of which vestments should be made come under the consideration of the author. Likewise, he includes *antependia* and hangings and similar altar appurtenances. Chapters on symbols and ornaments round out the general treatment of the clothing of the ministers and the decoration of the sanctuary. The result is a quite comprehensive if somewhat repetitious work on liturgical dress and decoration.

There is considerable propaganda for a return to the mediaeval pattern of ecclesiastical vestments. The ample chasuble is preferred to the more common form and small, medium, and full chasubles represent to the author a kind of positive, comparative, and superlative in excellence. His defense of the so-called ample, *alias* Gothic, chasubles is an interesting specimen of interpretation of the pronouncement of the Congregation of Sacred Rites against innovations in liturgical costume.

The illustrations in the book deserve special mention, particularly those which emphasize the contrast between the correct and the incorrect, the tasteful and the extravagant. The work will find sympathetic readers among those who love simplicity rather than elaboration, whose idea of vestments is Polonius's "neat not gaudy" but it will probably exasperate those who cling to Rococco traditions of the last two centuries without realization of their fantastic departure from mediaeval and early Renaissance designs in the manufacture of vestments and altar furnishings.

We can recommend the book to all who are interested in the accurate and beautiful in chasuble and cope, dalmatic and stole, alb and surplice, who will also appreciate the practical directions concerning the making and material of vestments. The emphasis is constantly on dignity and elegance as opposed to mere ornament for ornament's sake and any substitution of the synthetic for the real.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU.

QUELLEN DES HEILS. DIE SAKRAMENTE DER KATHOLISCHEN KIRCHE. By Joseph Barbel, C.SS.R. Luxemburg: Druck und Verlag. P. Jungers, Remich, 1947. Pp. 294.

When Christ came on earth He said: "I am come that they may have life and have it more abundantly." In the practice of the Christian life there is no doubt that doing is more important than knowing, that action is more important than knowledge. However, very often the Christian life is not led "more abundantly" because people have not a full grasp of the riches of the message of Christ. Knowledge leads to a greater appreciation, and to a deeper living of Christian life. That is why modern Popes in their addresses on Catholic Action and in their talks to Catechetical groups insist on a deeper living of Catholic life by a deeper grasp of Catholic teaching. The ideal is living the Christian life and growing deeper in a knowledge of it so that there emerges a living knowledge (p. 13).

The sources of Christian life are the Sacraments. Accordingly, Fr. Barbel sets before himself the task of presenting sacramental life in all its implications and ramifications in order to bring out how one can make his Christian life fuller and deeper by making the most of the means of grace. The outline of the book is obvious. The first chapter gives the setting for sacramental life and sacramental theology. Then he takes up each of the seven Sacraments. However, it would be wrong to think that the book is merely a modern adaptation of a dogmatic work on sacramental theology. True, the work is marked by theological precision. However, the author enriches the theology of the Sacraments by linking it up with the liturgy, by bringing out the spiritual and ascetical truths that flow from it, by showing the reaction of the Fathers, mediaeval theologians, and modern Popes to this storehouse of Christian life. While stressing the effect of personal holiness produced by the Sacraments, Fr. Barbel is by no means unmindful of the social benefits that flow from a deep living of the Christian life.

Treating the Sacraments in this way there is a great deal gathered in this one book that is usually scattered in various books, e.g., books on sacramental and pastoral theology, liturgy, ascetism, patristic studies. A priest could use this to great advantage in guiding the lives of others and in guiding his own life. The chapter on the priesthood is truly a masterpiece. There is a great deal of food for thought in the last two sections of this chapter, entitled: "Wholly for Christ," and "For the Whole Christ."

The notes and selected bibliography are found at the end of the book. It is a pleasure to note that Fr. Barbel has availed himself of the products of American scholarship. All in all, this is a work well done. It is a work that deserves to be translated into English.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

THE MYSTICAL EVOLUTION IN THE DEVELOPMENT AND VITALITY OF THE CHURCH. By the Rev. J. G. Arintero, O.P. Translated by the Rev. J. Aumann, O.P. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1949. Vol I, pp. xix + 358. $4.50.

For more than forty years the name of John Arintero of the Order of Preachers has commanded considerable attention and respect in the field of ascetical and mystical theology both in his native Spain and on the European continent generally. A man of great personal holiness and spiritual gifts, an outstanding and prolific spiritual writer, founder of the spiritual review *La vida sobrenatural,* a popular retreat-master and spiritual director, guide of numerous advanced souls, Fr. Arintero's spiritual writings, if not his name, have been a closed book to most of the interested persons in English-speaking lands. Contact has at last been made by the English translation of the work here under consideration.

The somewhat mysterious title may be rendered more intelligible by a note about Fr. Arintero's career. His early priestly years were spent in teaching the natural sciences at a time when the human evolution hypothesis was a burning question; and the young priest's energies were engaged in demonstrating the harmony that exists between divine revelation and the exact findings of true science. From this work he went on to the teaching of Apologetics, and after the turn of the century was granted permission to pursue exclusively the study of spiritual theology and the direction of souls. In 1908 he began what was to be his greatest literary achievement, *The Development and Vitality of the Church,* a four-part work which was to represent an application of a Christianized concept of evolution to the various phases of the living organism of the Church of Christ—the evolution of dogma, of Church government, etc. The Third Part of this work was called *Mystical Evolution,* and was to treat of the development and growth of the inner supernatural life of grace which the Church possesses and imparts to her children. It is this Third Part of his *magnum opus* which is recognized as Fr. Arintero's spiritual masterpiece, the first volume of which is now offered in a very commendable English translation by Fr. Jordan Aumann, O.P.

The author's Introduction is noteworthy, not only for the truly eloquent plea he makes for the study of spiritual theology, but also because of his contention that one of the most powerful means available for winning converts to the true Church is that of acquainting them with the vast treasures of supernatural life which the Church has to offer, and with the great possibilities for developing that life.

Early in the first chapter Fr. Arintero gives the orientation of his spiritual theology. The mystical life is the mysterious life of the grace of Jesus Christ in faithful souls who, dead to themselves, live hidden with Him in God. Development and growth in this life is conceived and presented by Fr. Arintero after the analogy of organic growth. Mystical evolution is, therefore, the entire process of the formation, growth, and expansion of that prodigious life until Christ is formed in us, and we are transformed in His divine image. There are three stages to this evolution; infancy, adolescence, and maturity. This divine life can be lived unconsciously, much in the manner that infants truly possess physical life but are unaware of it. It is in this way that beginners live and, in general, all who are called simple ascetics. Characteristic of ascetics are laborious meditation on the divine mysteries, mortification of the passions, and the methodical exercise of the virtues and pious exercises. This divine life can also be lived consciously, with a certain intimate experience of the mysterious touches, divine influxes, and vivifying presence of the Holy Spirit. The partial and intermittent development of this consciousness signalizes the adolescent stage in mystical development; its more or less full and constant realization, the mature stage. The special, though not exclusive, characteristics of these two latter stages are infused contemplation and the habitual living under the dominion of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which characteristics are realized imperfectly in the second stage, and more or less perfectly in the third.

By far the greatest portion of the work is devoted to an exposition of the nature of sanctifying grace and the divine indwelling, followed by a briefer though quite full treatment of the operations of divine grace through the infused virtues and the gifts of the Holy Spirit. In the exposition of these first two basic questions Fr. Arintero excels. He exhibits a profound knowledge of Sacred Scripture and its spiritual meaning, a deep grasp on the doctrine of the Fathers, and a remarkable familiarity with the teachings of spiritual writers, ancient and modern. The divinization effected by grace and the reality and significance of the divine indwelling are expounded with a clarity and force and unction the equal of which is rarely found.

The second and third portions of the author's original division—concerned with individual and collective growth—are treated with relative brevity, some sixty pages as over against two-hundred sixty for the first part. The section on individual growth is devoted to a brief exposition of what are commonly designated as the general means of perfection. The section on collective growth treats the role of the sacraments (especially Penance and the Eucharist), of the sacramentals, and of the Blessed Mother, in the development of the spiritual life. The treatment in these two sections is good, though by no means exhaustive, and one does not find the freshness of treatment or originality of approach which the title of the work and its divisions might have lead one to anticipate.

It is difficult, if not rash, to attempt an over-all appraisal of a work on the basis of only its first volume, so that any attempt made here is made with appropriate reservations. While *Mystical Evolution* hardly equals the synthesis of Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange's *Three Ages,* it promises to be when complete a good and faithful exposition of what is commonly designated as Dominican spirituality; and because of its less technical and more affective style will probably appeal to some who might be repelled by the *Three Ages.* Those theologians who take exception to Fr. Garrigou-Lagrange's synthesis on the score of his explanations of the nature of infused contemplation and of the gifts, will find the same grounds for complaint in Fr. Arintero's work. Although the book seems not to have been intended as a text in ascetical and mystical theology, and would hardly serve as such, still it would be highly desirable that all students in this field, and generally all souls striving for perfection, might feel the impact of Fr. Arintero's magnificent treatment of sanctifying grace and the divine indwelling. This feature of the work alone should make it profitable reading for beginner, proficient, and perfect alike.

R. E. REGAN, O.S.A.

MEXICO. A Land of Volcanoes. By Joseph H. L. Schlarman. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1950. Pp. xiv + 640. $5.00.

Despite the increasing activity of Catholic scholars and writers on the subject of Mexico within recent years, the bulk of literature in this field, always highly controversial, remains in the Masonic-Liberal tradition. A notable improvement of sentiment towards the Church among the official circles may be noted within the past decade, in contrast with the furious campaign of anti-Catholic propaganda during the height of the Revolution; and a more objective, scholarly approach towards the conquest and colonial era of Mexico has resulted in a fairer appraisal of the rich cultural contributions of Spain to the country. Nevertheless, the need remains for competent historical writing by Catholics in this field, dealing specifically with the controverted points, giving the Church a just defense against its vocal enemies, and reaffirming the reality of spiritual values in the development of the Mexican people.

In this book, Bishop Schlarman has rendered a most valuable service along these lines. In structure and sequence, he has related the history of Mexico, beginning with Spanish-European backgrounds of the Conquest and the colonial period, on through the era of independence, and concluding with the detailed story of the Revolution including the regime of President Cárdenas. In addition, he has provided, along the way, explanations of the principal problems and movements, together with a series of brief but brilliant character studies of the leading personalities involved. A number of well selected maps, portraits, and other illustrations add to the attractiveness and interest of the story; and thorough documentation establishes the scholarly character of the work.

As an aid to the general reader, each chapter is broken down into a number of subtitles. The general style leans to the journalistic and is decidedly vigorous. The book moves with the liveliness of a novel; and we feel the spirit of a crusading historian who is determined to tell the full truth and chastise rascality.

Within this framework, the book high-lights the controversies concerning the Catholic position and rounds out the information which everyone interested in this field should possess. Thus the story of the activities of the Jesuits and their expulsion from Mexico is given in detail. The influence of Freemasonry in Mexican affairs is traced through the era of Independence. The background and personalities concerned in the despoliation of the Church during the so-called Reform of Juarez are given a thorough analysis from a Catholic point of view. Likewise, the story of the Church-State conflict during the Calles regime is detailed and documented; and the Communist influences through the Presidency of Cárdenas are brought out, both in education and in economic programs.

Even in a volume of such monumental proportions, it is impossible to include everything of interest and importance. Nevertheless, it is unfortunate, in the opinion of this reviewer, that more attention could not be given to the cultural achievements of the colonial era in the fields of literature, art, architecture, and related activities. The subtitle indicates that the book carries through the Presidency of Alemán; but in effect it ends with the disputes of the Cárdenas term. No mention is made of changes that took place during the term of President Ávila Camacho. A review of these subsequent years would have brought the reader up to date and possibly given a better over-all view of the current picture and future outlook.

These omissions, however, are quite secondary in relation to the purpose and importance of the book. It should be read by every priest, and may be recommended to study groups, tourists, and to the general public interested in Mexico, as essential reading on the subject.

JAMES A. MAGNER

THE NAZARENE. Studies in New Testament Exegesis. By Eugenio Zolli, Professor of Semitics in the University of Rome. Translated by Cyril Vollert, S.J. St. Louis: Herder, 1950. Pp. 309. $5.00.

This book by the former chief rabbi of Rome, who has since become a staunch Catholic, deals with some exegetical problems of the New Testament. To their discussion and solution Zolli devotes all the resources of his ingenuity and learning. He is well acquainted with the literature pertaining to each topic which he treats; apparently he has read all the important authors, ancient and modern, Jewish and Christian, Catholic and Protestant. Especially prominent in the book is the skill with which he applies his knoweldge of Hebrew and Aramaic and his wide and deep reading in the rabbinical writings. His love for Jesus Christ imparts light and warmth to what is primarily a work of erudition.

The book is too crammed with learning and ingenious argumentation to be accurately summarized here. Hence we shall be content with reproducing some of his findings, without venturing to trace the process by which they were attained. For similar reasons we shall not attempt to evaluate the validity of his conclusions; we hope that competent scholars will be stimulated to essay the task personally.

Zolli argues that the appelaltion "Nazarene" bestowed upon Jesus cannot simply have arisen from the insignificant town of Nazareth. Accordingly, he derives the word from the Aramaic verb *neṣar*, which in Syriac has the meaning "to sing" "to declaim a poem." From this verb came the Aramaic nouns *naṣrana, naṣora,* signifying "preacher." These, in turn, are the source of the Greek *Nazarenos* and *Nazoraios.* Christ, therefore, was called the *nasrana* or Nazarene because he was a preacher of unusual power.

Zolli's disquisition on the "salt of the earth" is equally ingenious. How salt could lose its savor has always bothered exegetes. Zolli believes that the original Aramaic was misunderstood by the Greek translator. He reconstructs the text as follows: "You are the salt of the earth; if the salt should turn out to be a tasteless herb (thing) (or: if the salted thing should prove instead to be a tasteless thing), with what shall it be salted? (or: what shall be used to season food?)." He explains his reconstruction as follows: "(The disciples) are the salt of the earth; that is, each of them is . . . a *maluaḥ* a sharp, enlightened mind. But if the *maluaḥ* (the salted or intelligent man) should fail to be such and should prove to be a *malluaḥ* (a tasteless herb that has never been salted, a stupid fellow), if, in other words, the trust He placed in them should lack a solid foundation . . . then how could His teaching be disseminated among the nations?" (p. 156) To be fully appreciated the entire chapter on this topic should be read (pp. 145-57).

In Zolli's interpretation the text, "Give not that which is holy to dogs neither cast ye your pearls before swine becomes "Do not give your gold necklaces to dogs and do not cast strings of pearls before swine." The plausibility of this interpretation will become apparent on reading the pertinent chapter (pp. 158-66).

In the chapter on the "breaking of the bread" Zolli contends that the phrase "kat' oikon" does not indicate a custom of breaking bread in different houses or in each house. "The phrase means rather: a loaf per family, a loaf for a group of fellow-diners" (p. 203).

The remaining chapters also contain stimulating ideas. They treat of the following subjects: Exousia; Rabbinic and New Testament Methodology; "For a Testimony unto Them"; "Let the Dead Bury their Dead"; Lamb of God; the Farewell Discourse of Jesus; the Episode of the Two Swords; the Concept of Divine Justice in Hebrew Thought.

There is a copious bibliography and an adequate index. With the exception of one term (Hebraism, p. 100), the reviewer has found no foreign idioms in the translation, which is of high quality. The technical form of the book is praiseworthy, but the proofreader has overlooked some errors: *unitahtaw* (*umittahtaw,* p. 20); Zimzern (Zimmern, p. 27); vames (qames, p. 49); *kerusseie* (*kerussein,* p. 55); *exesein* (*exestin,* p. 73); sale (salt, p. 156).

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

THE FAMILY AT BETHANY. By Alfred O'Rahilly, M.A., D.Sc. Cork: Cork University Press, 1949. Pp. 216. Maps and illustrations, 70. Price 12/6.

In this book the distinguished lay president of University College, Cork, who has written meritorious works on moral and social philosophy, has invaded the scriptural field with conspicuous success. The present work is concerned with some of the most appealing episodes of the Gospel: the sinful woman of Galilee; the two sisters Martha and Mary; the raising of Lazarus; the supper at Bethany; Magdalen and the ministering women; Magdalen and the risen Christ; the witness of the women to the Resurrection; the possible identity of the sinner of Galilee with Mary of Bethania and Mary Magdalen; the parable of Dives and Lazarus.

The English text of each episode is presented with suitable subheadings, which help not inconsiderably towards understanding the story. Though not primarily philological, the author's commentary is equipped with excellent notes on the Greek original. They are printed in smaller type and may be omitted by the reader unacquainted with Greek. However, professors of Scripture and others with similar training will find their perusal of considerable utility. Far from being amateurish, they reveal an intimate knowledge of modern research and an admirable power of discrimination.

In the commentary every important statement and phase of the Gospel story is fully analyzed and explained. This analysis is not merely scientific; it is pervaded by a sense of spiritual values which makes it good reading for everyone desirous of advancement in the higher life. The spiritual value of the commentary is enhanced by special articles on such topics as Lazarus in art, Magdalen and the banquet in art, the perfume-bearers in art, Magdalen and the risen Christ in art. This will commend it not only to lovers of creative art but also to those who would study the expression of Christianity in the thought and emotions of past generations. In addition, the apologetic problems connected with some of the episodes receive adequate treatment. Thus there is a discussion on the tomb of Lazarus, the cerements, and the objections raised against the historicity of the event. The minor discrepancies in the accounts of the Resurrection are discussed with critical penetration.

Among the seventy illustrations there are sixty-six photographs. The index is, unfortunately, skimpy. But this is remedied to a large extent by the Contents, which are an analytical summary.

MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J.

DUTIES OF TEACHERS IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Let them [teachers in ecclesiastical institutions] strive with every force and effort to further the progress of the sciences which they teach; but let them also be careful not to transgress the limits which we have established for the protection of the truth of the Catholic faith and doctrine. With regard to new questions, which modern culture and progress have brought to the foreground, let them engage in the most careful research, but with the necessary prudence and caution; finally let them not think, indulging in false "eirenics," that the dissident and erring can happily be brought back to the bosom of the Church if the whole truth found in the Church is not sincerely taught to all without corruption or diminution.

—His Holiness Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical *Humani generis.*

BOOK NOTES

The Newman Press of Westminster, Maryland, has rendered a distinct service to the cause of American Catholic scholarship in reprinting a valuable but long since out-of-print English translation of one of the Abbot Fernand Cabrol's works. This book, *Liturgical Prayer, Its History and Spirit,* a translation of the brilliant Benedictine's *Le livre de la prière antique,* was first published twenty-nine years ago. Despite the many and excellent treatises which have appeared since that time, Dom Cabrol's masterpiece still retains its unique value as a source of appreciation of the Church's official prayer. The present edition, incidentally, sells for $3.50.

The same press has given us an excellent English translation, by E. J. Ross, of the Dominican Father Philipon's *The Message of Thérèse of Lisieux,* a work which should be very effective in promoting knowledge of and devotion to the saintly Little Flower. Fr. Philipon's analysis of her spirituality is sound and exact. The book sells for ninety cents in the paper bound edition. A cloth bound copy costs $2.00.

A somewhat similar book, likewise an excellent work, is *The Spirituality of St. Therese (An Introduction),* written by Fr. André Combes and translated by Msgr. Philip E. Hallett. This volume carries an introduction by Fr. Vernon Johnson, the famed English convert, who came into the Church largely as a result of his interest in the Saint of Lisieux, and a foreword by Archbishop Roger Beaussart, Dean of the Paris Chapter. Fr. Combes offers an accurate description, not only of the key ideas of the Little Flower's spirituality, but of the plan which guided her throughout her life. The book is published by P. J. Kenedy of New York and sells for $2.50.

A rather imposing literature for the Holy Year has already appeared. The most important contribution in English is the Newman Press' reprint of Fr. Thurston's *The Holy Year of Jubilee: An Account of the History and Ceremonial of the Roman Jubilee* (xxiv + 420 pp., $4.25). This fifty-year-old manual is a treasure of erudition on all that concerns the background and the meaning of the great pilgrimage. The publishing house of Sands and Company of London has issued a forty-nine page abridgement of this volume.

The Cocce Press of New York has produced a travel manual, *Touring Italy in 1950: A Holy Year Guide,* by Andre de Salza. This is intended as a practico-practical sort of work. The pilgrim is supposed to enter some Church or public monument, see what the author tells him he should see, and then go out, enter a waiting cab, and show the driver the title of the next section of the book, the place to which the driver presumably will drive his fare by the most direct route. Unfortunately the person who uses this book to see Rome will miss some very interesting experiences. The author merely guides his charges by the famed Church of Sant' Onofrio explaining that it "belongs to the Monastery of the Order of St. Jerome" (p. 76). Actually this Church is in charge of the American priests of the Society of the Atonement. It is one of the best known gathering places for Americans in Rome.

The Vatican and Holy Year, by Stephen Fenichell and Phillip Andrews (Halcyon House, Garden City, New York), is a book of 115 pages with a wealth of illustrations. For one reason or another its "aerial view of the Vatican" (p. 24), represents the approach to St. Peter's as it was before Mussolini tore out the blocks between the Borgo Nuovo and the Borgo Vecchio to make the modern Via del Conciliazione. The book sells for two dollars in a cloth-bound edition. The paper-bound copy costs one dollar.